DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 249 218 SP 025 346

AUTHOR	Lucas, Christopher J.
TITLE	Foundational Studies in Education.
INSTITUTION	Minnesota Univ., Minneapolis. National Support Systems Project.
SPONS AGENCY	Office of Special Education and Rehabilitative Services (ED), Washington, DC. Div. of Personnel Preparation.
PUB DATE	Sep 82
GRANT	OEG007902045
NOTE	181p.; For other modules in this series, see ED 238 844 and SP 025 332-354. For the genesis of these modules, see ED 186 399. Reviewed by Jesse Liles.
PUB TYPE	Guides - Classroom Use - Guides (For Teachers) (052)
EDRS PRICE	MF01/PC08 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	Academic Standards; Educational History; *Educational Philosophy; *Foundations of Education; Higher Education; *Humanistic Education; Learning Modules; Mainstreaming; Preservice Teacher Education; Relevance (Education); *Teacher Education Curriculum; *Teacher Educators
IDENTIFIERS	Education for All Handicapped Children Act

ABSTRACT

This module (part of a series of 24 modules) is on the basic intent of foundational studies in teacher education. The genesis of these materials is in the 10 "clusters of capabilities," outlined in the paper, "A Common Body of Practice for Teachers: The Challenge of Public Law 94-142 to Teacher Education." These clusters form the proposed core of professional knowledge needed by teachers in the future. The module is to be used by teacher educators to reexamine and enhance their current practice in preparing classroom teachers to work competently and comfortably with children who have a wide range of individual needs. The module includes objectives, scales for assessing the degree to which the identified knowledge and practices are prevalent in an existing teacher education program, and self-assessment test items. Journal articles are included on standards for academic instruction in foundations of education, a national assessment of foundations of education, and the foundational education component in regulations governing teacher education and certification. (JD)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION
CENTER (ERIC)

☒ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

- Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

These materials are developed pursuant to Grant No. OEG007902045 from the Division of Personnel Preparation, Special Education Programs, Office of Special Education and Rehabilitative Services, U.S. Department of Education. The points of view expressed herein are the author's and do not necessarily reflect the position or policy of the Special Education Office or the U.S. Department of Education. No official endorsement is intended.

Minneapolis, Minnesota

1982

Development. Materials are developed under direction of the National Support Systems Project, University of Minnesota, under the Grant No. referenced above.

Distribution. Materials are available through The American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education (AACTE), Suite 610, One Dupont Circle, Washington, DC 20036. For information on costs and distribution, contact that office.

Extending the Challenge:

Working Toward a Common Body of Practice for Teachers

Concerned educators have always wrestled with issues of excellence and professional development. It is argued, in the paper "A Common Body of Practice for Teachers: The Challenge of Public Law 94-142 to Teacher Education,"* that the Education for All Handicapped Children Act of 1975 provides the necessary impetus for a concerted reexamination of teacher education. Further, it is argued that this reexamination should enhance the process of establishing a body of knowledge common to the members of the teaching profession. The paper continues, then, by outlining clusters of capabilities that may be included in the common body of knowledge. These clusters of capabilities provide the basis for the following materials.

The materials are oriented toward assessment and development. First, the various components, rating scales, self-assessments, sets of objectives, and respective rationale and knowledge bases are designed to enable teacher educators to assess current practice relative to the knowledge, skills, and commitments outlined in the aforementioned paper. The assessment is conducted not necessarily to determine the worthiness of a program or practice, but rather to reexamine current practice in order to articulate essential common elements of teacher education. In effect then, the "challenge" paper and the ensuing materials incite further discussion regarding a common body of practice for teachers.

Second and closely aligned to assessment is the developmental perspective offered by these materials. The assessment process allows the user to view current practice on a developmental continuum. Therefore, desired or more appropriate practice is readily identifiable. On another, perhaps more important dimension, the "challenge" paper and these materials focus discussion on preservice teacher education. In making decisions regarding a common body of practice it is essential that specific knowledge, skill and commitment be acquired at the preservice level. It is also essential that other additional specific knowledge, skill, and commitment be acquired as a teacher is inducted into the profession and matures with years of experience. Differentiating among these levels of professional development is paramount. These materials can be used in forums in which focused discussion will explicate better the necessary elements of preservice teacher education. This explication will then allow more productive discourse on the necessary capabilities of beginning teachers and the necessary capabilities of experienced teachers.

---

*Published by the American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education, Washington, D.C., 1980 ($5.50).

In brief, this work is an effort to capitalize on the creative ferment of the teaching profession in striving toward excellence and professional development. The work is to be viewed as evolutionary and formative. Contributions from our colleagues are heartily welcomed.

This paper presents one module in a series of resource materials are designed for use by teacher educators. The genesis of these materials is in the ten "clusters of capabilities," outlined in the paper, "A Common Body of Practice for Teachers: The Challenge of Public Law 94-142 to Teacher Education," which form the proposed core of professional knowledge needed by professional teachers who will practice in the world of tomorrow. The resource materials are to be used by teacher educators to reexamine and enhance their current practice in preparing classroom teachers to work competently and comfortably with children who have a wide range of individual needs. Each module provides further elaboration of a specified "cluster of capabilities" or, in this case, a description and rationale for foundational studies in teacher education.

Contents

Within this module are the following components: Page

Objectives. The objectives focus on the teacher educator rather than as a student (pre-service teacher). They identify what can be expected as a result of working through the materials in terms of better understanding the nature and role of the foundational component in teacher education. Objectives which apply to prospective teachers are also identified. They are statements which should frame a "common body of practice" in teacher education. 6

Rating Scale. A scale is included by which a teacher educator could, in a cursory way, assess the degree to which the foundational component described in this module prevails in an existing teacher-training program. The rating scale also provides a catalyst for further thinking regarding this topic. 8

Self-Assessment. Specific test items were developed to determine a user's working knowledge of the major concepts and relevant data concerning foundational studies in teacher education. The self-assessment may be used as a pre-assessment to determine whether one would find it worthwhile to go through the module or as a self check, after the materials have been worked through. 9

Rationale and Knowledge Base. An extended bibliographical essay summarizes the knowledge base and empirical considerations relative to defining the place of foundational studies in teacher education. The rationale supplied concludes with a few brief discussion questions. 17

Bibliography. A partial bibliography of relevant periodical literature and ERIC documents is included after the list of references. 99

Articles. Four brief articles (reproduced with permission) accompany the aforementioned components. The articles support and expand on the knowledge base. 107

Objectives

Upon completion of this module you will be better able:

1. To identify and characterize the nature and scope of foundational studies in education;
2. To enumerate the six major foci of concern and interest with which foundational studies are most typically identified;
3. To reproduce the rationale underlying the "humanistic and behavioral" standard for basic teacher preparatory programs advanced by the National Council for the Accreditation of Teacher Education (NCATE);
4. To reproduce the rationale for a foundational component in teacher preparation offered by the American Educational Studies Association (AESA);
5. To trace the major outlines of the historical development of the foundations of education as a field of research and instruction;
6. To summarize the major issues dividing liberal-arts faculties and proponents of academically-based professional-education programs;
7. To identify the major issues dividing proponents of a "liberal" vs. a "technical-vocational" conception of teacher education;
8. To understand basic differences in the approach of those who defend a discipline-based organization of foundational studies vs. proponents of the "social foundations of education" orientation;
9. To identify dominant trends in the organization and content of foundational courses in education;
10. To explicate a rationale for the inclusion of foundational studies as an integral component of professional teacher-preparation.
11. To review how foundational purposes and content may come to fit within an emergent professional consensus on a common body of knowledge for teachers.

Reasonable Objectives For Teacher Education

All students should have access to relevant factual knowledge, practical skills, and commitment to professional performance in the following areas relative to foundational inquiry:

1. Opportunity for systematic exposure to foundational studies aimed at promoting interpretive, normative, and critical perspectives upon education as a socio-cultural phenomenon.
2. Understanding of, and appreciation for, issues involved in the study of education as a scholarly field of inquiry and as a practical endeavor.
3. "Contextual" knowledge regarding distinctions among theory, policy, and practice in education including:
    - a) alternative frames of reference for understanding, analyzing, interpreting, and criticizing educational theory and practice;
    - b) exposure to appropriate concepts and methodologies necessary for the critical examination of assumptions, beliefs, and values underlying theory, policy, and practice in education;
    - c) information concerning the social, political, economic, historical or philosophical meaning and implications of educational phenomena.

Rating Scale For The Teacher Preparation Program

Check the statement that best describes the level of your present teacher-education program's commitment to foundational studies:

_____ 1. Students being prepared for teaching are afforded little or no opportunity for a systematic introduction to education as a field of study. No course of a "foundational" nature is required of beginning students.

_____ 2. Students being prepared for teaching are required to complete an introductory course in the foundations of education, but the program neither offers nor requires completion of further coursework in foundational studies of a social and humanistic nature.

_____ 3. Students being prepared for teaching are required to complete an introductory course in the social foundations of education (or its equivalent) and one or more additional specialized courses whose staffing, content, and aims are in substantial complicance with relevant national accreditation standards and norms.

_____ 4. Students being prepared for teaching are required to complete foundational coursework which represents approximately one-sixth of all required credit-hours in professional education; and such coursework is in full compliance with relevant national accreditation standards and norms.

_____ 5. Students being prepared for teaching are required to complete approximately one-sixth of their professional education in foundational coursework; such coursework exceeds the relevant national accreditation standards and norms and has been systematically structured to fit a program-wide conceptualization of the purpose of foundational coursework.

Self-Assessment

The following items are intended to assess your understanding of significant issues involved in defining the nature and function or role of foundational studies in pre-service teacher education.

1. The most widely-accepted connotation of the term "foundations of education" implies:
   - ___ a. preliminary, or prerequisite to, logically prior
   - ___ b. basic, fundamental
   - ___ c. structurally supportive, undergirding or underpinning
   - ___ d. essential, important

2. Which of the following statements most accurately describes the extent of foundational studies in teacher-education programs around the turn of the century?
   - ___ a. Courses in the history or philosophy of education were non-existent.
   - ___ b. Courses in the foundations of education were infrequently offered as electives.
   - ___ c. Foundational studies were integrated within courses in pedagogy and curriculum.
   - ___ d. Foundational courses constituted the bulk of all professional education offerings.

3. The attitude of most liberal-arts faculty toward the development of courses and programs in professional education, historically, may best be described as one of:
   - ___ a. enthusiastic acceptance
   - ___ b. qualified and cautious support
   - ___ c. collaboration and active cooperation
   - ___ d. derision, scorn, and skepticism

4. The rise of a so-called "scientific" movement in education in the early 1900's had the practical effect of
   - ___ a. integrating liberal and professional elements in teacher education
   - ___ b. de-emphasizing non-empirical "theory" in teacher preparation

   ___ c. expanding support for foundational studies in teacher education
   ___ d. enhancing the academic legitimacy and popular accountability of teacher education

5. The emergence of "social foundations" as a teaching area and field of inquiry was owed chiefly to
   ___ a. a reaction against social activism in educational theory and practice
   ___ b. administrative re-organization at leading teacher-education institutions
   ___ c. the influence of John Dewey and his disciples
   ___ d. the rise of psychometrics and the testing movement in education

6. The "social foundations" approach to the study of education emphasizes:
   ___ a. disciplinary specialization
   ___ b. interdisciplinary integration and synthesis
   ___ c. objectivity and neutrality
   ___ d. the psychology of teaching-learning processes

7. "Discipline-based" approaches to the study of education are most frequently criticized for their alleged:
   ___ a. lack of structure
   ___ b. resistance to educational reform
   ___ c. advocacy of radical social and cultural change
   ___ d. impracticality and irrelevance

8. A "normative" perspective upon education entails consideration of
   ___ a. the historical development of schooling
   ___ b. the economic determinants of school curricula
   ___ c. social-class structure in relation to schooling
   ___ d. norms and values as determinants of educational policy and practice

9. Most foundational scholars consider empirical and quantitative work in educational psychology:

___ a. as an essential element within the foundations of education

___ b. as a viable alternative to so-called "humanistic" studies in education

___ c. as "foundational" in nature but not an integral element of humanistic foundational studies in education

___ d. as relatively useless

10. Critics such as Arthur Bestor and James Conant attacked the propriety or legitimacy of foundational courses in schools, colleges, and departments of education because they believed such courses:

___ a. represented a needless duplication of existing courses

___ b. infringed upon the perogatives of local school districts

___ c. served to reduce teacher education to a species of craft training

___ d. exaggerated the academic values of neutrality and objectivity in the study of education

11. Many (though not necessarily all) scholars in the foundations of education have evinced skepticism toward a competency-based approach to teacher preparation because they are persuaded that:

___ a. teaching competencies cannot be defined with sufficient precision and specificity

___ b. the "average" teacher-candidate is unlikely to achieve proficiency in, or mastery of, the necessary competencies

___ c. teaching is not reducible to a discrete set of tasks and performances

___ d. competency-based instruction ignores or minimizes the affective domain of learning

12. The "humanistic" component of teacher education mandated by the National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education (NCATE):

___ a. endorses open-space classrooms and values clarification

___ b. requires individualized instruction and assessment

___ c. encourages the inclusion of instruction informed by the insights of the social-science disciplines and humanities

___ d. opposes behaviorism as a psychological and educational theory

13. A recurrent theme most frequently cited as a way of integrating foundational studies in education entails:

___ a. the relationship between school and society

___ b. the psychological dynamics of instruction and curricula

___ c. self-concept, human interaction, and child development

___ d. the comparative analysis of national school systems

14. "Meta-knowledge" has as its object of inquiry:

___ a. knowledge about metaphysics

___ b. the philosophy of schooling

___ c. knowledge about knowledge

___ d. the mechanics of soico-cultural reproduction

15. The Philosophy of Education Society (PES) defines philsophy of education primarily as:

___ a. the study of what is real, good, and beautiful and its educational implications

___ b. an activity or process of investigation

___ c. an analysis and defense of educational aims, goals, or objectives

___ d. a search for eternal truths in education

16. The most common approach to the teaching of philosophy of education involves:

___ a. description and comparison of alternative systems or schools of thought

___ b. a survey of "great ideas" among philosophers who have addressed educational concerns

___ c. the analysis of educational concepts and issues
___ d. social criticism

17. The "typical" pre-service teacher-education program requires how many semester-credit hours of coursework (or its equivalent) in the foundations of education?
___ a. 3-4 hours
___ b. 4-6 hours
___ c. 6-12 hours
___ d. 12-18 hours

18. Foundational coursework typically accounts for what percentage of all required coursework (exclusive of clinical field experiences) in the "average" teacher-preparation program for elementary education majors?
___ a. around 15 percent
___ b. around 20 percent
___ c. around 25 percent
___ d. around 33 percent

19. Foundational coursework typically accounts for what percentage of all required coursework (exclusive of clinical field experiences) in the "average" teacher-preparation program for secondary education majors?
___ a. around 10 percent
___ b. around 15 percent
___ c. around 20 percent
___ d. around 25 percent

20. Foundational courses in education tend most frequently to be organized in terms of:
___ a. issues and concepts in education
___ b. the historical development of schooling
___ c. schooling's philosophical orientation
___ d. the economics and politics of schooling

21. Those who teach foundational courses in education allegedly view their task most often as:

___ a. imparting pedagogical expertise
___ b. advocating social and educational reform
___ c. describing educational phenomena
___ d. providing a broad theoretical perspective on education

22. A common complaint among many teacher-educators that those teaching foundational courses are "subversive" or "disloyal" to the profession arises from the tendency of the latter to:
___ a. criticize or question the status quo
___ b. advocate non-democratic means for achieving educational reforms
___ c. encourage "utopian" solutions to real-life educational problems
___ d. deny that teaching can or should be considered a genuine profession

23. A "foundational" analysis of Public Law 94-182 would most likely involve:
___ a. identification of the policies and practices necessary for its successful implementation
___ b. a description of the law and prescriptions for carrying out the mandate created by such legislation
___ c. criticism of, or an attack upon, the legitimacy and workability of such legislation
___ d. an interpretation of the social meaning and normative implications of the law

24. The topic of "mainstreaming" in public schooling:
___ a. would be an inappropriate issue to be considered in a course in the foundations of education
___ b. would be unlikely to be dealt with except in a very cursory fashion in a course in foundations
___ c. might warrant considerable attention as an issue in a foundations course
___ d. could furnish the integrative focus for an entire course in foundations

25. The search for a common body of practice in teacher education assumes:

___ a. diversity and experimentation are undesirable
___ b. the possibility of consensus among teacher-educators regarding skills or competencies necessary for successful teaching
___ c. theory-oriented instruction in teacher education is unnecessary
___ d. teacher preparation should consist mainly of clinical experiences and actual practice teaching

Attitudinal Inventory:

Check the space corresponding to the statement that most closely represents your own attitude or belief.

26. Courses in the foundations of education within teacher-education programs:

___ a. are essential and should be expanded as component elements of preparatory programs
___ b. serve a useful though limited function in teacher preparation
___ c. should be retained only as electives for students interested in such studies
___ d. are dysfunctional and should be abolished

27. Most of the teacher candidates with whom I am familiar as students or advisees tend to view required courses in the foundations of education as:

___ a. useless and irrelevant
___ b. difficult and obscure
___ c. challenging but impractical
___ d. interesting and essential

28. Courses in the foundations of education:

___ a. should address specific issues and problems classroom practitioners may expect to confront in their daily work

___ b. should offer a broad perspective on the field of education

___ c. should impart specific norms, values, and standards to guide educational policy and practice.

___ d. should directly help to improve teaching methodology and curriculum development

29. As perceived by most of my colleagues in teacher-education, research and teaching in foundational studies:

___ a. appears "esoteric" and difficult to comprehend

___ b. is generally ignored as irrelevant to major professional concerns in teacher preparation

___ c. is usually accepted but poorly understood

___ d. is perceived as useful and relevant

30. Programs of undergraduate teacher education

___ a. should "tell it like it is" and offer practical training for the "real" world of teaching as it presently exists

___ b. should teach "against the profession" and attempt to prepare change-agents who will reform the educational system

___ c. should expose prospective teachers to a specific set of ideals and standards by which they may judge prevailing practice

___ d. should enable students to evaluate critically existing theory and practice in education

Assessment Key

1. d
2. d
3. d
4. b
5. b
6. b
7. d
8. d
9. c
10. a
11. c
12. c
13. a
14. a
15. b
16. a
17. a
18. a
19. c
20. a
21. d
22. a
23. d
24. c
25. b

Defining Foundational Studies In Education

Much confusion and misunderstanding have resulted from the use of the term "foundations" to describe a field or fields of study in education generally and also as a description for a component element within teacher-preparation programs. "Inevitably," as Harry Broudy once observed, "the word makes one think of the building trades, or those great philanthropic geese that lay the golden eggs for educational reform, or the art of corsetry.... All these connotations have their roots in the notion of beginning.... Along with the connotation of initiation or beginning goes the idea of importance. What is foundational is supposed to be fundamental, basic, supportive."[1]

Echoing a common complaint, he judged these images and their penumbral meanings to be quite unsatisfactory:

> To begin with, the foundational studies are rarely first in order of instruction.... In the second place, the metaphor of a foundation as holding something up, as something on which one builds, fails badly when used in connection with educational history and philosophy, and limps even with regard to the psychology and sociology of education.[2]

Donald Warren likewise considered the label troublesome:

> First, it misleads, suggesting that 'Foundations' is basic to, if not at the center of, teacher education. It is neither, nor should it be. Second,

> the name is imprecise in that it fails to characterize a unique component of preparation programs. To the extent that teacher education prepares people to teach, all of its components are foundational. In various ways and with different resources, all attempt to solve the same basic dilemma, to conceptualize and maintain the distinction between preparation and teaching. Third, the name lends itself to grave misinterpretation. It encourages the self-contradictory notion that a component of teacher education can be anti-practice when the Foundations' unique potential lies in the opposite direction, in the capacity to nurture impracticality within the context of preparing teachers for professional practice.[3]

Several years ago R. Freeman Butts similarly took note of the distortion created by the term "foundations" of education in the sense of suggesting underpinnings or a supportive structure. Its proper meaning, he argued, is more closely allied with the notion of "essential" or "fundamental" than to the idea of a structural undergirding for something else. Butts further commented, "The emphasis is upon fundamental ideas, concepts, scholarship, and theory essential for understanding and improving practice and techniques."[4]

Thus, the rubric "foundations" has multiple connotations, none of which is entirely adequate to describe the nature, content, and function of the activities designated:

(1) Preliminary, or prerequisite to, logically prior;
(2) Basic, fundamental;
(3) Structurally supportive, undergirding or underpinning;
(4) Essential, important

Of the four major alternatives, the last may be the most defensible construction, though it falls short of characterizing how or why the studies and activities subsumed under the term presumably have special significance or importance. Mindful of the limitations inherent in the descriptor "foundational studies" or "foundations of education," several writers have attempted to offer alternatives such as "education(al) studies," or "policy studies" in education--which may or may not necessarily have the same referents. In any event, although such terms have found limited acceptance, the phrase "foundations of education," sometimes preceded by the modifier "social" and/or "cultural," remains more common. For want of a more adequate label, the foundational designation continues in use.

Whatever the specific locution employed, a recurrent theme in most formulations is the idea of a linkage between one or more of the established academic disciplines in the humanities and social sciences, on the one hand, and the theory and/or practice of education on the other. The conjunction is suggested by the hybrid "disciplines" or "subdisciplines" or "areas" of specialized inquiry, research and teaching associated with the foundations of education: philosophy of education, history of education, sociology of education, anthropology of education, and so on. Alternatively, the adjective "educational" as a modifier precedes references to various disciplines, as in educational anthropology, education sociology, educational history, educational philosophy, and so forth.

Also closely tied to the foundational label are courses in comparative and international education, educational policy studies, the social or cultural foundations of education, principles of education, aesthetics and education, religion and education, introduction to education, and (occasionally, depending on how they are construed), curriculum theory, multi-cultural education, issues in education, and psychology of education, or educational psychology.

An older, well-established connotation for foundational studies in education emphasizes the integrative and cross-disciplinary or multi-disciplinary character of research and teaching in the field rather than disciplinary affiliations as such. Thus, for example, many institutions offer courses bearing such titles as "Social Foundations of Education" or "Cultural Foundations" which do not mark out any particular disciplinary base or approach to the study of education. This appears to be especially true of onmibus, survey-type courses of an introductory nature in professsional education.

Designators for the "foundational" component in undergraduate pre-service teacher-education programs exhibit considerable variety and ambiguity. In a recent study of undergraduate foundations of education courses most frequently offered by schools, colleges, and departments of education, it was found that coursework could be categorized in rank order, as follows:

(1) Introduction to Education;
(2) Philosophy of Education;
(3) History of American Education;
(4) Curriculum Theory;
(5) (Humanistic) Psychology of Education;
(6) Issues and Trends In Education;
(7) School Law;
(8) Social Foundations of Education;
(9) Multi-cultural Education;
(10) School Organization, Management;
(11) Comparative and International Education;
(12) Human Relations in Education;
(13) Sociology of Education; and
(14) History of Educational Thought.

Less frequently offered were courses in contemporary educational theory, politics and education, religion and education, educational economics, aesthetics and education, policy analysis in education, educational anthropology, world history of education, and contemporary criticism in education.[5]

Terminology appearing in state regulations governing initial teacher certification or in guidelines for state approval of preparatory programs for teachers likewise makes use of many different phrases or descriptions. Within those rules that do refer explicitly to a foundational component, the following terms were identified in one recent national survey, in order of frequency:

"Foundations of education"

"Philosophy of education"

"History of education"

"Psychological foundations of education"

"Social foundations of education"

"Philosophical foundations of education"

"Comparative education"

"Historical foundations of education"

"Introduction to education"

"Principles of education"

"Cultural foundations of education"

"Current issues in education"

"Educational context or system"

"Multicultural education"

"Orientation in education"

"School as social institution"

"School in relation to society"

"Sociology of education"

"Study of the school"[6]

Overall, the permissiveness of official or institutional nomenclature makes it exceedingly difficult to fix precisely the identity of foundational studies in education. Acerbating that difficulty is perennial disagreement on the same issue among foundational scholars themselves. With considerable justification, one writer has noted, "...The field seems to be undergoing a crisis of identity, as evidenced by the lack of agreement on a name; a common frame of reference; or for that matter, its very reason for being."[7] Minimally, however, it seems safe to claim that the foundations of education have as broad foci of concern and interest:

(1) description, analysis, interpretation, and criticism of theory, policy, and practice in education;

(2) elucidation of the assumptions, presuppositions, beliefs, and values underlying educational theory, policy, or practice;

(3) study of the theory of the theory (i.e., "meta-theory") of teaching and learning;

(4) study of the complex interrelations between culture or society and the school (and other educative agencies and influences);

(5) study of the social, political, economic, and moral meanings or implications of educational processes and events;

(6) exploration of contemporary issues, controversies, trends, and movements in education.

AESA And NCATE Standards For Foundational Studies

The closest approximation to an "official" or authoritative characterization of the "foundations of education" is supplied in a set of Standards adopted in 1977 by the American Educational Studies Association (AESA). As therein defined, the term was taken to refer to "a broadly-conceived field of study that derives its character and fundamental theories from a number of academic disciplines, combinations of disciplines, and area studies: history, philosophy, sociology, anthropology, religion, political science, economics, psychology, comparative and international education, educational studies, and educational policy studies."[8]

The AESA Task Force responsible for drafting the Association's guidelines noted that foundational studies in education have been represented by a number of variant approaches and interpretation:

> There are those who have promoted the idea that Foundations of Education should be assembled around educational issues, using the issues as curriculum-selecting and curriculum-organizing principles. Some have insisted that interdisciplinary and generalist concerns should supercede the commitments of Foundations of Education scholars to specific disciplines. Others have held to the priority of close disciplinary ties for Foundations of Education scholars. Some have promoted the desirability of curriculum liaisons between Foundations of Education scholars and teacher-educators in other fields, for example, administration, counseling and guidance, urban education, and curriculum and instruction. Still others have argued for the establishment of working ties between Foundations of Education scholars and community groups, and for involvement in areas of concern that go beyond

> the schooling enterprise. At the present time there are distinguished advocates for all these approaches.[9]

Nonetheless, an "overarching and profoundly important" academic and professional purpose allegedly unifies persons who identify with any of these differing approaches to the foundational study of education, namely, "the development of interpretive, normative, and critical perspectives on education, including non-schooling enterprises."[10] The AESA document's characterizations are worthy of quotation in full:

(1) The interpretive perspectives, using theories and resources developed within the humanities and the social and behavioral sciences, assist students in examining and explaining education within differing contexts. Foundational studies promote analyses of the meaning, intent, and effects of educational institutions, including schools. Educational thought and practice inevitably reflect particular contexts and beliefs. They can be perceived differently from various historical, philosophical, cultural, and social class perspectives. Education, whether in the form of schooling or some other arrangement, thus cannot be understood merely in terms of its present and immediately visible characteristics. Understanding follows from attempts to interpret

educational thought and practice within their special contexts and to translate them from one perspective to another. This deeper level of understanding is required of scholars who expect to increase knowledge about education and of practitioners committed to the delivery or improvement of educational services. The effectiveness of both kinds of professionals depends fundamentally on their intelligent comprehension of educational thought and practice. A major task of foundational studies is to provide the resources, incentives, and skills students require in performing the interpretive functions.

(2) The normative perspectives assist students in examining and explaining education in light of value orientations. Foundational studies promote understanding of normative and ethical behavior in educational development and recognition of the inevitable presence of normative influences in educational thought and practice. Foundational studies probe the nature of assumptions about education and schooling. They examine the relation of policy analysis to values and the extent to which educational policymaking reflects values. Finally, they encourage students to develop their own value positions regarding education on the basis of critical study and their own reflections.

(3) The critical perspectives assist students in examining and explaining education in light of its origins, major influences, and consequences. Foundational studies promote critical understanding of educational thought and practice, and of the decisions and events which have shaped them, in their various contexts. These multi-dimensional modes of analysis

> encourage students to develop inquiry skills, question educational assumptions and arrangements, and subject them to critical review. In particular, the critical perspectives provided through foundational studies enable students to examine equality and inequality in the distribution of educational opportunity and outcome. They promote understanding of past and present patterns of exclusion in education, the causes of exclusion and inequality, and the educational needs and aspiration of excluded minorities. Finally, foundational studies encourage the development of policymaking perspectives and skills in searching for resolutions to educational problems and issues.[11]

Foundational study of interpretive, normative, and critical perspectives within education, as the AESA's Task Force commented, tends to rely heavily on "the resources and methodologies" of the humanities, particularly history and philosophy, and the social and behavioral sciences. Its primary objective, as the Task Force phrased it, "is to sharpen students' abilities to examine and explain educational proposals, arrangements, and practices and to develop a disciplined sense of policy-oriented educational responsibility." Foundational studies encourage "knowledge and understanding of education historically and philosophically and in view of its social, economic, and political relations."[12]

Predictably, the AESA definition of foundations of education as a field of study has been criticized for its vagueness or ambiguity. Critics have pointed out, for example, that in attempting to delimit the field the statement appears to include the behavioral sciences along with the humanities and the social sciences as cognate disciplines to educational foundations. Elsewhere, however, the claim is made that educational psychology "is not an acceptable substitute..." for coursework in the foundations of education.[13]

Confusion on this point, it should be noted, stems from the conjunction of "humanistic" and "behavioral" studies within another standard governing the accreditation of teacher-education programs, as advanced by the National-Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education (NCATE). Specifically, Standard #2.3.2 applicable to basic programs stipulates that "the professional studies component of each curriculum for prospective teachers" shall include "instruction in the humanistic studies and the behavioral studies." The accompanying narrative offering a rationale for the standard reads as follows:

> Many disciplines are important in the preparation of teachers. However, not all disciplines are equally relevant, and their relevance is not always obvious. In the following standard it is assumed that problems concerning the nature and aims of education, the curriculum, the organization and administration of a school system, and the process of teaching and learning can be studied with respect to their historical development and the related philosophical issues. These studies are referred to hereafter as the humanistic studies. The problems of education can also be studied with respect

> to the findings and methods of psychology, sociology, anthropology, economics, and political science. Such studies are referred to as behavioral studies. These humanistic and behavioral studies differ from the usual study of history, philosophy, psychology, sociology, anthropology, economics, and political science in that they address themselves to the problems of education. The major purpose of such studies is to provide the student with a set of contexts in which educational problems can be understood and interpreted.
>
> The humanistic and behavioral studies require a familiarity with the parent disciplines on which they are based. This familiarity may be acquired as part of the general studies and/or as part of the content for the teaching specialty.
>
> The standard does not imply that instruction in the humanistic and behavioral studies should be organized or structured in a particular way. Instruction in these studies may be offered in such courses as history and/or philosophy of education, educational sociology, psychology of education or as an integral part of such courses as history, philosophy, psychology, sociology; or as topics in foundation courses, problems in education courses, or in professional block programs; or as independent readings.[14]

Clearly, the NCATE standard is highly formal in character. It specifically disavows any intent to mandate a particular course or set of courses; and it does not indicate except in the most general terms possible what the content of instruction should be. Nor does the AESA document. The problem is that whereas the former document speaks of humanistic and behavioral studies, its wording does not rule out an interpretation under which "or" could substitute for "and." In other words, a course in psychology of education alone (a "behavioral" study) might technically satisfy the NCATE standard. The AESA definition, however, was intended to exclude this possibility, i.e., educational psychology is not, properly speaking, a component element within the foundations of education, at least not in the same way as history or philosophy of education. Confusion arises then in fixing the place of "non-behavioral" psychology of education, curriculum theory, and so forth vis-à-vis the foundations.

The intent of those who drafted the AESA standards apparently was to devise a formulation or definition of the foundations which would emphasize a "humanistic" over a "behavioral" interpretation of NCATE Standard 2.3.2. In short, while it was acknowledged that psychological studies in education could be "foundational" in some negotiable sense, the practical concern was to proscribe the substitution of coursework in psychology of education for coursework in history, philosophy, sociology, or anthropology of education or coursework of an integrative, multi-disciplinary character.

Again, critics have taken exception to the fact that the American Educational Studies Association's official position is to support a "diversity" of arrangements and approaches to foundational curricula and instruction. As Nash and Agne complain,

> Unfortunately, the statement tries too hard to incorporate all the traditionally dissident foundational groups within the AESA umbrella. Thus, AESA officially supports the presence of foundational faculty who are predominantly contemporary issues oriented, or interdisciplinarians, or generalists, or disciplinarians, or liaison-minded, or community advocates, as long as each...promotes 'interpretive, normative, and critical perspectives' on education. The difficulty with this well-intended effort...is that the current chaos of perspective, policy, and content in the foundational field is maintained. Indeed, faculty who deal with anything remotely conceptual in content can justify their offerings as 'foundational.'[15]

Further, it has been said that the interpretive, normative, and critical perspectives encouraged by AESA's statement are insufficiently differentiated. Nash and Agne, once again, argue that the first two appear to reduce to the "critical," whereby students are enjoined "to develop inquiry skills, question educational assumptions and arrangements, and subject them to critical review." To outside observers, it has appeared that the exclusive concern of foundational studies is to produce gratuitous criticism of existing policies and practices in education, without regard for what may be defensible and entirely legitimate about existing arrangements. Furthermore, it is doubtful whether the specification of interpretive, normative, and critical perspectives suggests anything unique or distinctive about foundational instruction. Many people working in counseling, language arts, curriculum, and other specialties, for instance, would likely argue that they also are concerned with "contextual" knowledge, that they intend to promote understanding of the meaning, intent, and effects of educational institutions, that they wish to encourage the development of "inquiry skills," and that they too offer a "value orientation" on educational thought and practice.

In response, the AESA definition of educational foundations has been defended by one of its original authors as a necessary first step in providing greater coherence and a shared sense of identity for the field:

> The definitions applied to the foundations vary. Some hold to the traditional offerings of philosophy, history and psychology of education; some utilize a broader notion of the social foundations of education including anthropology, sociology, economics, and political science; some prefer the more integrative 'interpretive, normative, and critical' label developed by the American Educational Studies Association this past decade. Whatever definition one prefers, the mission of the foundations must be understood, institutionalized, and effectively implemented if the education profession and our public educational institutions are to survive the challenges of the 1980s.[16]

Reflecting back on the work that went into devising a formula capable of reflecting a variety of foundational approaches, Alan Jones recalled, "I participated in an extended and often agonizing effort to define the foundations of education in a contemporary context and to set forth academic standards by which the acceptable performance of the foundational role in professional education could be judged."[17] He quoted approvingly from Maxine Greene on the need for such standards when she commented, "...without memory, without a feeling of connectedness and continuity, there can be no sense of personal identity. Much the same is true about cultural identity and the identity of a profession or a field."[18]

Nonetheless, as several critics have noted, the question of an identity for foundational studies in education has always proven troublesome. Today more than ever the onus is upon scholars in the field to demonstrate to colleagues and students the professional validity and relevance of what they teach, and that there is something distinctive about foundational studies that warrants their inclusion as a required element in preparatory programs for teachers. In no sense is this need for explanation and justification a recent phenomenon. Proponents of foundations of education have always faced the challenge of defending the legitimacy of the field since its inception roughly a century ago.

The Origins Of Foundational Studies

The beginnings of foundational studies in education in an academic setting trace back to the early 1880's when formal courses in the history and philosophy of education first made their appearance. Coursework in the "foundations" loomed large in early teacher-preparatory curricula. The reason was obvious. As Jennings Wagoner has noted, "In trying to develop a science or discipline of education, in attempting to 'professionalize' education, the creators of the field were forced to borrow liberally from existing bodies of knowledge."[19]

Little formal knowledge about organizing curricula, managing teaching and learning processes, or educational administration existed in the late nineteenth century. Research was rudimentary at best. Hence those who pioneered in the development of courses in professional education borrowed freely what they could from all available sources, seeking to provide substance for an emerging field of study. Attempting to "flesh out" meagre course offerings, the earliest university professors of education culled the pedagogical treatises of the Greeks and Romans for relevant instructional materials. They adapted from the writings of the Church fathers, from the essays of prominent Renaissance and Reformation figures, and from works on education authored by various theorists and practitioners of the seventeenth, eighteenth, and nineteenth centuries. Prior to 1900, in fact, history of education was one of the most commonly-offered courses in normal institutions, teachers' colleges, and in fledgling university-based schools or departments of education.[20]

After 1900, however, professional education courses gan to proliferate quickly. Educational psychology, courses in assessment and evaluation, teaching methods and instructional management, curriculum, and administrative supervision all began to crowd the once-substantial position claimed by the original foundational studies.[21] By the 1920's, history of education no longer represented the most important field of study required of prospective educators:[22]

> If we examine the frequency of required courses in the past, we find a gradually changing pattern. In 1905...history of education was the most frequently required of all courses for prospective teachers in normal schools and colleges. Psychology was next most frequently required, and practice teaching after that. Courses labelled pedagogy and school management were less frequently required. In 1914, practice teaching was required more often than anything else, but history of education was just behind in frequency. Next in order was psychology, followed by courses in school management, child study, and principles of teaching. By 1933, practice teaching had retained its preeminence, and educational psychology and general psychology were the next most frequently required courses. School administration and supervision followed, and courses called 'Principles of Teaching' and 'Introduction to Teaching' came last in frequency.

> Thus the humanistic foundations, first represented at the turn of the century by ubiquitous courses in the history of education, all but disappeared in the Depression, represented only--if at all--by occasionally required catch-all kinds of courses.[23]

Factors responsible for the erosion of humanistic-foundational studies in teacher education were not difficult to discern. Chief among them was a burgeoning "scientific" movement in education which promised greater efficiency and economy in the management of instruction. As explained by Charles Judd of the University of Chicago, the field of education was to be separated from "theory" altogether and wedded to a new "science" of testing and measurement.[24] Accordingly, the criterion by which to judge any course in teacher-training was its scientific (i.e., experimental-empirical) validity and, more broadly, its immediate applicability.[25] Not surprisingly then, as scientism in education gained in popularity, liberal or humanistic courses were banished from the center of teacher education and relegated more and more to the periphery. A romance with the trappings of scientific precision and technology in American teacher preparation, it was increasingly evident, marked the beginnings of a major new trend. Ultimately, it threatened to make foundational studies a marginal species.

Meanwhile, other forces were working to throw the foundations of education on the defensive. First and foremost was opposition from liberal-arts faculties to the development of all professional courses in education and the establishment of education as an academic field. With ample justification in many cases, critics assailed the curricula of schools, departments and colleges of education for lack of substance and scholarly vigor. At Harvard in the early 1890's, according to one account, many members of the academic faculty viewed the department of education with barely-disguised contempt.[26] Nor did these attitudes of suspicion and skepticism change much in the decades following. Needless to add perhaps, courses in the history or philosophy of education were singled out as special targets for criticism. Because they were organized and staffed by "educationists " not by specialists in the cognate disciplines, they were suspect. Worse yet, it was alleged, such offerings failed to reflect the objectivity of their parent disciplines. Their function, or so it was claimed, was more laudatory and inspirational than it was bring historical or philosophical perspective and insight to the work of preparing classroom teachers.

In point of fact, allegations by liberal-arts professors that foundations courses were unscholarly and poorly-taught were generally well-founded. In the early 1900's and for some time thereafter, foundational courses did suffer from a lack of adequate instructional resources and poorly-prepared instructors. Few departments of education had trained historians or philosophers on their faculty; and many who offered instruction in such subjects did so on a part-time basis only. Most were not thoroughly versed in the subject-matter they taught.

As if opposition from liberal arts faculties was not enough, foundational scholars in education also had to contend with the doubts of their own colleagues in schools or departments of education as to the value or relevance of their courses in a professional program. Just as the struggle between protagonists of liberal and professional education was waged between liberal-arts professors and education faculty, the same issue surfaced in contests among rival factions within teacher education itself.

Some teacher-educators strongly supported a liberal component within teacher education, and hence were inclined to defend the legitimacy of offering foundational courses in the history or philosophy or sociology of education. Others however, questioned whether coursework lacking any obvious and immediate utility deserved a place in professional teacher education. In a very real sense, tension between professionally-oriented "utilitarians" or "functionalists" and liberal "academicians" proved enduring. Controversy between the two factions continues to the present day, with one group arguing that teacher-training should be strictly "vocational," and another that teacher preparation cannot and should not be construed as a narrow technical enterprise. The place of foundational studies in education has often depended on which viewpoint predominates at any given moment.

Foundational scholars themselves, historically, have reproduced in microcosm this same controversy over the propriety of coursework not directly geared to the exigencies of classroom practice. One viewpoint holds that research and teaching in the field is analogous to their equivalents in other fields; that is, study about education is a more or less autonomous, academically self-justifying endeavor. The fact that such studies typically are lodged in professional schools is taken to be purely fortuitous. Another point of view--with many graduations in between--is concerned to emphasize the practical or utilitarian character of educational foundations. In one form or another the issue furnishes a topic of perennial debate. It was to assume a new guise in the 1930's, coincident with the emergence of the so-called "social foundations" of education as an institutional entity.

The Emergence Of Social Foundations

A major reconceptualization of foundational studies in education was the product of an organizational restructuring that occured at Teachers College, Columbia University, in the early Thirties. From an administrative standpoint, foundations took shape as one of five divisions, comprising "all that was left" after the four divisions of Administration, Curriculum and Instruction, Tests and Measurements, and Guidance had been created. It included "history of education, philosophy of education, educational sociology, educational economics, comparative education, and some aspects of educational psychology."[27]

The creation of Division I, Social and Philosophical Foundations of Education, at Teachers College gave obvious impetus to a move to consolidate and integrate instruction in what heretofore had been separate specialized courses reflecting their respective disciplinary affiliations. The chief inspiration for developing one or more interdisciplinary courses of a foundational nature was provided by a small group of social activists and reformers whose members included such well-known educators as George Counts, Harold Rugg, John Childs, and William Heard Kilpatrick. The result of their efforts in 1934-35 was a two-semester course entitled "Social Foundations of Education."[28]

By the 1940's, this interdisciplinary model had been adopted at a number of other teacher-training institutions. Its stress was upon the integration of disciplinary knowledge in the service of social reconstruction. Convinced that teacher education should more directly address pressing contemporary issues and problems in society at large, proponents of the social foundations approach saw integrative courses as important vehicles for enlisting teachers in a campaign to build "a new social order." This activist strain was echoed in principles enunciated by another group of foundational scholars affiliated with the College of Education at the University of Illinois, where a reorganization between 1947 and 1950 had led to the creation of a similar Division of Historical, Comparative, Philosophical, and Social Foundations of Education. "Social foundations as a field," it was affirmed," is concerned with those aspects and problems of society which need to be taken into account in determining educational policy, especially as this policy concerns the social role of the school, and in determining broader social policies which affect educational policy."[29]

As the Illinois group viewed them, courses in the social foundations, first, should be "functional" in the sense of developing "professional competence to deal with important contemporary educational problems," and, secondly, they should be interdisciplinary in character, drawing inspiration from many different academic fields. How to achieve that two-fold aim, however, remained open to question. Efforts at synthesis simply fueled the debate between those who viewed foundational studies as derivative from, and dependent upon, the traditional academic disciplines and those who sought to create an independent foundational discipline in its own right.

The former point of view was supported by those who feared that history or philosophy of education would disappear into the anonymity of integrated courses in "social foundations." While a discipline-based approach might conceivbly shed light on current policy issues or problems, supporters argued, courses in foundations should be taught with liberal rather than functional values uppermost in mind. And above all they should be taught separately and not be allowed to be swallowed up in an inchaote potpourri called social or cultural foundations.

The latter perspective, emphasizing problem-solving and direct attention to contemporary policy quesions, was just as vigorously defended. According to the position enunciated at Illinois in the Fifties, the need to deal with social issues would have to supercede disciplinary loyalties. The foundations were not viewed as independent from the traditional disciplines, but in a foundational context the disciplines would assume a rather different relationship to one another than they would have in their own settings. The product of an interdisciplinary integration, it was hoped, would be an "area" of study whose focus was upon educational policies and practices. The notion of an integrative "field," something which has its own reality apart from the aggregation of its elements but which still preserves their individual identities, was held up as an ideal.[30]

Two Opposing Conceptions Of Foundational Studies

This enduring internecine battle between those who perceived foundational studies as liberal disciplines and those who view the field as "functional," of direct utility to practitioners, reverberates even at the present time. Ever since the emergence of social foundations courses, opponents have fought for the rigor and purity of a discipline-based orientation. Others advocate an approach transcending any single disciplinary frame of reference, one more directly addressed to practical issues of policy and practice in education. As Walter Feinberg noted, it is a "central dispute," expressed many times and in different ways, but one which can be captured by a single question:

> Is the understanding of a practical activity such as education best approached by modeling inquiry after the established disciplines, or is there something about the object of educational understanding itself which cannot be captured by any single discipline or even by adding together the insights of many disciplines?

"Each side of this dispute," he commented, "has its advocates, and it is an issue which had been raised in more than one of the allied disciplines. On one side of the issue stand the traditional foundationists who believe in an integrated course of study in which the insights of various disciplines have been sifted and sorted for that which speaks to the practical work of schooling. On the other side are those who believe that to subordinate a discipline to some unquestioned end, such as the improvement of schooling, is ultimately to distort its insights and to turn it into a tool of propaganda and ideology.

Feinberg appeared to support criticisms directed against "traditional foundationists" that their work has been too closely tied to the concern of immediate practice, and in particular, charges that most social-foundations advocates have been insufficiently critical of existing school usage:

> It is said that they have been unable and perhaps unwilling to look critically at the relationships between schooling and other more powerful institutions, and thereby to see the crucial ways in which schools are bent, shaped, and molded by dominant interest groups. It also has been said that they have watered down the insights of the disciplines by looking at the past from their perspective in the present. It is said that they have served as apologists for the public schools and have given educational scholarship a bad name.[32]

On the opposing side are those like Norman Bernier and Averile McClelland who flatly assert: "When the foundations of education remain tied to the traditional disciplines, they continue to be both derivative and dependent. When they expand their horizons and focus on education writ large, they become generative and autonomous."[33] David Conrad, Robert Nash and David Shiman are equally adamant on the point, having argued on numerous occasions that when teachers of foundations courses cling intractably to their own disciplines, whether it be philosophy, anthropology, or history of education, they run the risk of turning themselves into merely decorative atavisms in teacher education:

> Today, foundations people can no longer remain dispassionatley analytical, continuing to provide educators with what they consider the indispensable theoretical basis for action. This classical apologia for including the foundations of education in teacher preparations is now obsolete.[34]

The problem with a specialized educational philosopher, historian, or sociologist, they allege, is that he or she tends to feel most comfortable in his or her specialty and is reluctant to become involved in anything beyond the investigative, analytic dimension of education. Many do not even view their principal function to be the education of teachers at all. What ails the social and humanistic foundations, they claim, is a "slavish tendency to ape the disciplines." Insofar as foundational scholars attempt to borrow legitimacy from academic disciplines, they neglect the day-to-day professional concerns of their natural constituents: prospective and practicing educators. Instead, like their counterparts in the disciplines to whom they look for models, they spend inordinate amounts of time debating and critiquing one another on trivial technical issues. All the while they neglect the radical reorganization and integration of subject matter so sorely needed in educational studies.[35]

According to the same authors, the typical foundations scholar tends to be "out of touch" with what is going on in the schools. His or her commitment to subject matter and to the study of education as a discipline precludes anything other than the "disengaged vantage point of academician-outsider" in examining schooling processes. He or she forgets that the foundational area "should provide interdisciplinary illumination of the myriad issues and problems confronting the contemporary educator."[36] Elsewhere, discussing what they call "a suicidal syndrome," they commented:

> While students everywhere continue to challenge the validity of our offerings, and while many administrators severely limit or even discontinue our programs, we in foundational fields still strive assiduously to become more rigorous; i.e., we persist in 'strengthening' our course offerings so that they mirror even more closely offerings in the scholarly disciplines.... For all of our talk about the value of cross-fertilization and general understanding, we still cling tenaciously to the boundaries of the established disciplines. We still fail to realize that in real life situations the knowledge categories are not segmented; problems in the real world of the school and other social institutions require interdisciplinary approaches for their resolution.[37]

The divorce of theory from application characteristic of foundational courses, they further allege, stems from an emphasis upon abstract analysis and knowledge-building (the legacy of the disciplines) rather than on "interpretation and explanation of actual educational situations and the development of problem-solving procedures." Not surprisingly, they argue that foundational studies should link theory and practice, should be taught by genuine interdisciplinarians, should be "down-to-earth rather than esoteric," should be "problem-based," and infused with a greater sense of "social purpose and conviction." Their conclusion is that

> Foundational studies will justify their place in teacher training programs when they are vigorously cross-disciplinary; when they are unifying in terms

> of fostering composite models of human behavior, needs, motivation, and learning; when they are as concerned with exploring, and helping people to develop, workable theories as they have traditionally been with building esoteric theories that too often are merely espoused but not practiced; when they can provide more vital and provocative explanatory constructs, as well as a variety of experimental efforts to demonstrate the tactical implications of those constructs; when they become more "full-bodied," as concerned with the personal meaning of information as they are with intellectual inquiry and analysis; and when they abdicate their historical disengagement from the affairs of the socio-political/educational world and begin to advocate a larger, normative social vision.[38]

Critics

Ordinarily, an "internal" argument over the proper conceptualization and organization of foundational studies in education might appear trivial and relatively unimportant to outsiders. In point of fact, however, the disputation touches upon a fundamental issue: what role (if any) foundational studies have in teacher education, and, more broadly, the character of teacher preparation itself. More specifically, the basic question is the nature of the contribution foundational studies can or should try to offer in preparing teachers for their myriad tasks.

The issue assumes special urgency against the background of a barrage of criticism from those who question whether foundational studies have any raison d'être whatsoever. Sometimes the attack is levied by those within the educational professoriate. Just as often critics speak from outside the Education Establishment. Arthur E. Bestor, a historian at the University of Illinois, was one among several detractors, beginning in the 1950's, who questioned the legitimacy of such courses as philosophy and history of education.

In his widely read Educational Wastelands (1953) and again in Restoration of Learning (1955), for example, Bestor criticized those who, he alleged, had demonstrated "no real interest in interdisciplinary cooperation and no sense of academic partnership" by creating independent courses in educational history and philosophy within schools or colleges of education. He condemned the "warping of the great intellectual disciplines to serve the narrow purposes of indoctrination and vocationalism" allegedly represented by such courses, and called for a "process of devolution" whereby these would be re-aborbed back into the academic departments where they properly belonged.[39]

Shortly thereafter James D. Koerner took issue with the claim that prospective teachers should be exposed to anything akin to philosophy or history of education, claiming that philosophical opinions about education, as he phrased it, "tend to be hortatory, histrionic, and proselytic...not closely related to observable, measurable phenomena." Since philosophical consideration are "abstruse by nature and lend themselves more to persuasion than proof," Koerner concluded, they should be eliminated entirely from teacher-training programs.[40]

More thoughtful by far was the judgment offered in James B. Conant's influential The Education of American Teachers (1963). If there was a demonstrable need for prospective educators to study the social foundations of education, he argued, that need could be best satisfied through courses taught by professors of philosophy, history, political science, anthropology, sociology, and psychology. Consequently, he saw little need for separate courses offered in schools, colleges, or departments of education.[41]

Conant reserved his sharpest condemnation, however, for introductory courses in foundations of education. As he viewed them, they were eclectic patchworks of history, philosophy, sociology, and pedagogy--typically suffering from superficiality of treatment and utterly devoid of any integrative focus. His advice was to scrap them, "for not only are they usually worthless, but they give education departments a bad name."[42]

Predictably, the reaction to Conant's critique from scholars in the foundations was almost universally negative. In particular, foundations people took issue with Conant's seeming indifference to the study of educational theory.[43] Critics pointed out that if his recommendations were followed, the effect would be to regress teacher education back to the days of simple apprenticeship training.[44] The teaching act, it was alleged, cannot be reduced to "the habitual application of a set of routines" or performance tasks to be learned by rote and applied in some rigid mechanical fashion. Classroom instruction, in other words, cannot be construed as a craft like plumbing or carpentry, best learned through experience alone.[45]

More recently, B. Othanel Smith, in A Design for a School of Pedagogy has reiterated Conant's anti-theoretical stance vis-à-vis teacher education. The only sort of "theory" Smith is prepared to accept is "empirical clinical knowledge." As he puts it, "Academic pedagogical knowledge...seldom yields teaching prescriptions...."[46] Inasmuch as the aim of teacher training is to prepare candidates to teach, clinical observation or direct experience with existing strategies and techniques are preferable to learning "non-empirical" theoretical knowledge about teaching. Thus, foundations courses presumably could be dispensed with, because, as Smith phrases it, "teachers are correct when they assert that what they learn in the so-called foundations of education is not helpful in managing the classroom and carrying on instructional activities." Foundational knowledge, in short, "is not appropriate for the development of skills for either classroom or interaction with peers and laypersons."[47] The pre-service student, Smith insists, should not be exposed to "theories and practices derived from ideologies and philosophies about the way schools should be. The rule should be to teach, and to teach thoroughly, the knowledge and skills that equip beginning teachers to work successfully in today's classroom."[48]

Reviewing Basic Issues

A number of issues have been brought to the fore by critics such as Smith, by Bestor, Conant, and Koerner before him, and by many others too numerous to cite. Some have been alluded to previously. Framed as questions, they include the following:

(1) Is teacher preparation reducible to a species of craft-training, consisting of the acquisition of a discrete set of skills, performance-competencies, and tasks? Can or should these "competencies" be learned without benefit of some understanding or awareness of their theoretical underpinnings? How atheoretical should teacher education be?

(2) Can teachers be trained primarily in field settings and through direct clinical experience?

(3) If there is a defensible theoretical component in teacher education, is it exclusively or primarily descriptive and empirical in character? Or does it include a normative and a critical dimension? Is the process of preparing teachers ideologically or politically neutral? Does teaching competence consist wholly of a mastery of pre-defined instructional and management techniques?

(4) Does the concept of "professionalism" in education imply a need for prospective classroom practitioners to acquire "contextual" knowledge about the theory and practice of education?

(5) How can so-called foundational studies in education best satisfy the alleged need for "perspective" or sense of "context"?

(6) Who should teach foundations courses? Where should foundational courses be housed in academic institutions?

(7) How should such courses be organized? Should there be separate specialized courses in history, philosophy, sociology, and the politics of education, each reflecting the content and forms of inquiry of their respective parent disciplines? Or, alternatively, is the paramount need for an interdisciplinary synthesis and integration, one structured around the study of education as an academic discipline and borrowing its motive concepts from within education itself (e.g., curriculum, instruction, teaching, learning, schooling, educational aims and objectives, knowledge, etc.)?

(8) Can foundational studies in education be best defined in terms of content or by purposes and objectives? Do they assume their identity primarily in terms of a definable body of subject matter, or in terms of the role they play in teacher education?

More simply, these sets of questions reduced to three basic issues:

(1) What should be the main content of foundational courses in education?

(2) How should foundational studies be organized and presented?

(3) What purposes can the foundations fulfill in teacher education?

In considering these three themes, it will be helpful, first, to review a representative portion of what in recent years has become a voluminous literature dealing with proposals for unifying foundational studies; secondly, to examine the actual scope of the foundational component in pre-service preparatory programs; and then, finally, based partly on whatever consensus may be apparent, to outline a possible rationale for foundational studies in teacher education.

The Search For Unity

Attempts to delineate a single integrative theme or focus for foundational studies or to stipulate an irreducible content "core" have been as varied as they have been unsuccessful. John Lipkin, for example, once argued that the study of the relationship between education and the social order constitutes a "central postulate" from which stems both the reationale and the content of educational foundations studies. The reciprocal school-society relationship, he insisted, "is the key to the ultimate purpose of foundations studies." In amplifying his argument, Lipkin explained:

> ...It should be apparent that our study cannot be restricted to a single discipline. Instead, the findings and methods of history, philosophy, and the social sciences would be utilized insofar

> as they are relevant to the school-society relationship. This study could not be considered a discipline in the conventional sense, for it does not possess separate and unique methods and subject matter. We would prefer to consider it a disciplined study, adhering to the established canons of scholarship, with the advantage of being a borrower and lender without impunity.[49]

Similar though somewhat broader in scope was the proposal offered by William Stanley that the social foundations of education concentrate on such themes as the nature of humankind, the meaning "of the good and the public welfare," the nature of knowledge, the relation of the school to the social order, and processes of social change.[50]

Joseph Browde, on the other hand, urged a "dynamic" approach involving three organizing themes: "man," "society," and "education/schooling." The theme of "man allegedly offers opportunities to pursue such questions as "What does it mean to be a human being?" and "How do human beings differ from other life-forms?" Further questions would concern how and why human individuals behave in the ways they do, drawing upon philosophy, developmental psychology, and learning theory for possible answers. Dealing with society would require confronting questions about "the meaning of culture, the development of institutions, socialization, the problems of interpersonal, intergroup, and world relations, and the rule of government with respect to social philosophies." The theme of "education/schooling," as Browde characterized it, would consider a broad range of historical, social, political, and moral issues in their educational bearings.[51]

In contrast, James W. Wagener saw "knowledge about knowledge" (meta-knowledge)--"the configuration of knowledge as it defines the learner and his environment and...the alternatives open...for shaping this environment"--as a central target of analysis. In essence, his thesis was that foundations courses should deal with "the phenomenon of knowledge, which...means the configuration of noetic claims made at any given time." He continued, "The configuration or shape of knowledge is not the substance of those claims: facts, ideas, information, data. Nor can it be reduced to the structure of knowledge or modes of analyzing knowledge.... The shape of knowledge refers rather to meta-knowledge or knowledge about knowledge."[52] Again, Albert Grande, pursuing a more psychologically-based approach, pressed for a focus in foundational courses upon self-concept, human interaction, and the dynamics of the teaching task.[53]

For R. Freeman Butts, the "ultimate goal" of foundational study, as he put it, "is normative and judgmental; it is the effort to solve problems, improve policy and practice, and move in desired educational and social directions." While insisting that improved judgment would require a secure grounding in objective, empirical, and disciplined methods of analysis provided by scholarly fields of knowledge, he added, "We must. .face the fact that education is integrally involved in the deepest social concerns of society and culture.

Education is often involved in the crises points, the turmoil, the conflict, and the controversy that swirl around the process of social and cultural change." Consequently, Butts emphasized, "the knowledge we require is policy-oriented knowledge, knowledge that is relevent to those deepest social concerns that affect education."

"The foundational task," he continued, "is thus nothing less than the use of disciplined knowledge to understand and evaluate the most fundamental social and cultural problems of...societies, the direction the societies are moving, and the role that education should play in that movement." Pleading for a less provincial outlook, Butts concluded that the proper theoretical framework for foundational studies in education should be "the interdisciplinary study of the modernization process and the role that education should play as traditional societies either seek or are impelled to transform themselves into modern societies." Modernization, he argued, would provide a "principle of selection" for materials to be included in the foundational study of education.[54]

More detailed and substantive in its specifics was the proposal advanced by Nicholas Appleton in his call for a "modular" approach to the foundations of education.[55] Basically, his was a reaction to the common complaint that foundational courses lack structure. As Moses Stambler had observed, "...The traditional courses in social foundations [have] a heavy reliance on bits and fragments of insight from the social sciences and humanities; this course consists of fragmented materials without any internal logic, discipline or rationality. At some institutions this course has turned into an amorphous, directionless operation...."[56] Appleton's answer was to abandon the traditional course format in favor of a series of "mini-courses" or instructional units, each of which would be more or less self-contained. The first two, as he described them, would provide "a pervasive conceptual scheme" on which to build other foundational themes and processes of inquiry through secceeding modules.

Appleton's first proposed module was to "investigate the concepts and principles inherent in a pluralistic society." The second, closely related to the first, would present and explore "the principles of democracy which we, as a society, profess to value and toward which we constantly strive, all the while attempting to base the mechanics of our societal relationships on these principles." Because American society's social structure is based on these two ideals, they play a major role in the operation of American education. All major issues in education, the basis of authority, professionalism, racial equality, or the investigation and application of theoretical constructs, he asserted, must be viewed and interpreted within the framework of these concepts.[57]

Appleton cited from "an almost infinite number of possibilities" several possible "areas of interest" around which other modules could be organized, including "the civil rights of teachers," "professionalism in education," "educating the powerless," and "religion and public education." Under his scheme, the organization of foundational studies would be open-ended, thereby providing the opportunity to add or subtract modules depending on need or circumstances.

Taking their cue from the American Educational Association's claim that foundational courses should "foster a reflective, critical perspective" on the educational venture, Nash and Agne posed a series of "foundational questions" they felt should frame coursework: How educable are people? What is the importance of education? What ought to be the qualities of the educated person? What is ethical policy and practice? Who should go to school? What should be studied? Who should educate? Who should be the educational leaders? Does education have intrinsic as well as instrumental ends? Is education a discipline? Does education occur in settings other than schools? Throughout, they urged "an analytic, questioning approach to educational problems," particularly those involving human relationships, as the sine qua non of educational foundations.[58]

Landon Beyer and Kenneth Zeichner have offered a similar list of questions: What kind of educational institutions are most desirable or appropriate, and why? How did the present system of education develop, and upon what basic ideas and values does it depend? Whose interests does the system serve? Is the role of schools in contemporary society ethically defensible? Foundations instruction, they argued, should underscore the political nature of schooling and open up for scrutiny and debate questions having to do with the development, functions, and consequences of schooling. Courses should focus upon "the social dimensions of education, especially the role of schools in the wider social order, and hence generate questions of a normative and ideological sort."[59]

Similar in character to Wagener's claim that "meta-knowledge" should frame the foundations was Walter Feinberg's judgment that educational studies could be unified through the study of the role of formal and informal agencies in socio-cultural _reproduction_. Education, he observed, "is best understood by recognizing that one of the functions of any society is that of maintaining intergenerational continuity--that is, of maintaining its identity as a society across generations...and it is education...which carries on this function." Hence, foundational studies should concentrate upon "the aims and processess of social reproduction as reflected in the practices of institutions and individuals." More specifically, according to Feinberg, the "clear domain" for integrated educational studies would be analysis of "the knowledge code of a given society and the way in which that code is processed by different individuals and groups, through different frames and with different implications for the reproduction of skills and the reproduction of consciousness."[60]

As many more examples might be cited to illustrate the tremendous variety of conceptual models, themes, and approaches offered as ways of unifying research and teaching in foundational studies. Some are psychologically or sociologically oriented; some emphasize a philosophical or social-anthropological perspective; some stress historical development; and a few introduce a comparative and international dimension. Many highlight political issues and concerns relating to education. It is tempting to see some proposals as being somewhat ideosyncratic, that is, they appear to reflect an individual author's experience, training, and particular interests oftentimes more than a comprehensive judgment of what is most central to the field. What the various schema do share in common, however, is an interdisciplinary or "trans-disciplinary" frame of reference. Nonetheless, no one has yet adduced a sufficiently attractive or compelling rationale for any given position such that it has won universal assent. Experimentation and diversity will likely continue, with some courses organized around concepts (e.g., teaching, learning, schooling, curriculum, aims and objectives), some based on issues or problems (equality of access and opportunity, religion in education, minority education, etc.), trends or movements in education (mainstreaming, compensatory education, vocationalism, back-to-basics, futurism, and so on); and some structured around broad interdisciplinary "themes" (modernization, socio-cultural reproduction, meta-knowledge, professionalism in education, power and authority, governance, school and society, etc. *ad infinitum*). Some courses, finally will attempt to combine all four orientations.

Permutations In Discipline-Based Foundational Studies

In smaller teacher-training institutions, a single integrative or multi-disciplinary "social foundations of education" course is the norm, often serving the dual function of providing an introduction to the field of professional education as well. Only in the larger, more prestigious schools, colleges, and departments of education is it possible to offer an array of specialized courses in philosophy of education, history of education, educational sociology, comparative education, and so on. At some schools, two or more courses are required in the teacher-education curriculum. More common is the arrangement whereby students select one course from among several in order to satisfy the "foundational" requirement in their programs.

Not counting introductory survey courses and psychology of education, philosophy and history of education are the two foundational courses most frequently offered at the undergraduate level. Each may exhibit tremendous variability in terms of content, conceptual orientation, and pedogogical approach.

Philosophy of Education. As set forth in its "Standards for Academic and Professional Instruction in Philosophy of Education" (1980), the Philosophy of Education Society (PES) stipulates that philosophical studies in education ought to "provide essential skills and concepts that cannot be treated quintessentially in behavioral, historical and pedagogical components of teacher education programs." Philosophy of education "focuses on the principles, criteria and methods of achieving clarity and consistency in judgments," of detecting and evaluating basic assumptions, and of critically evaluating the soundness of arguments: It is to be understood as a "activity" that:

> ...confronts the most basic and general conceptions in (1) arguing about underlying causes of social and educational phenomena, as well as other questions dealing with the nature of reality, (2) analyzing contending purposes and standards for education, as well as other ethical questions, and (3) evaluating the basic principles and criteria we employ or assume when we make claims to the truthfulness of what we say. Philosophical studies may also have an integrative or synthesizing dimension, providing for the comprehensive collation and evaluation of theories, from a variety of disciplines, on general and basic questions regarding education as a fundamental cultural enterprise.[61]

Furthermore, the narrative accompanying the PES standards make it plain that philosophy of education is not general philosophy--it consists of "philosophic skills and concepts applied to educational concerns and issues." Nor is its study merely an opportunity to express or formulate a "personal philosophy." It is not a statement about current or proposed policies and practices, such as "all pupils should be treated with equal care and concern" or "we believe in the dignity of each individual." Rather, philosophy of education scrutinizes such slogans in order to formulate and justify educational purposes. Finally, the PES statement indicates that courses in philosophy of education should examine educational policies, practices or programs "in terms of axiological, epistemological, linguistic, logical and ontological considerations central to the philosophic enterprise." No single course, it is emphasized, is expected to cover all dimensions or applications of philosophic skills and subject matter and a variety of emphases and organizational patterns may be followed.[62]

In terms of how philosophy of education courses are actually taught, that "variety" is readily apparent. The following table suggests, according to one recent study, a dozen or so instructional approaches employed:[63]

Organization Of Content/Instructional Approach	% Of Respondents
Philosophic systems or schools of thought in their educational bearings (e.g., Realism, Idealism, Pragmatism, Existentialism, etc.)	21
"Other" (Unspecified or not classified)	13
Philosophers of education, classical and modern, and their doctrines	11
Philosophic categories of inquiry (e.g., metaphysics, epistemology, ethics, etc.) applied to educational issues, concepts, problems	9
Social, political philosophy in relation to contemporary social, economic, and political issues in education	9

Existentialist, phenomenological criticism and education	9
School and society, ideological movements in education	8
Selected contemporary education theorists (e.g., Piaget, Kohlberg, Bruner, R.S. Peters, etc.) and their writings	5
Analysis of concepts, arguments, etc. in educational discourse; theory construction in education, ordinary language analysis; philosophy as logical/ conceptual inquiry	5
Moral philosophy, ethics in education, normative discourse	3
Neo-Marxist interpretation, criticism of educational policy/practice	2
Critical theory, sociology of knowledge in relation to education	2
Policy analysis and education	2
Literary, aesthetic criticism, analysis and education	1

History of Education. Apart from whatever historiographical context or frame of reference predominates, courses in the history of education offer endless possibilities for how inquiry is to be sustained. The focus might be on educational *ideas*, ancient and modern. Or it might be *institutions* and their development. The emphasis might fall on one particular time period (e.g., American education since the 1600's) or it could encompass the entire span of Western civilization. Instruction could be organized around "themes" or "problems" of an historical nature; alternatively, a course might trace historical developments in chronological sequence. The table below indicates five common strategies prevalent in teaching the history of education:[64]

Organization Of Content/Instructional Approach	% Of Respondents
Survey of education from the American colonial period to modern times	31
Issue-oriented historical analysis of trends, concepts, problems, movements in education.	31
Survey of education from antiquity to modern times.	17
Exposition/analysis of major education theorists (e.g., Plato, Aristotle, Quintilian, Rousseau, Herbart, Mann, Dewey, Etc.)	17
"Other" (Unspecified or not classified)	3
In-depth analysis of specific historical period and/or geographical region (e.g., the Progressive Era, development of national school systems, etc.)	2

Sociology of Education. Like philosophy or history of education, courses in sociology of education also exhibit considerable variety. Without necessarily indicating the specific content in praticular courses surveyed, the following table ranks the four major approaches most frequently pursued:[65]

Organization Of Content/Instructional Approach	% Of Respondents
Concept or issue-oriented analysis of American education (e.g., socialization, social stratification by calss, race, sex, religion, etc.)	47
Descriptive overview of American school system, organization and administration, learner characteristics, access and attrition, sociological determinants of curricula, etc.	34

Sociological/*philosophic* *analysis*, *criticism*, utilizing theoretical constructs derived from prominent writers, e.g., Durkheim, Halbermas, etc.	10
"Other" (Unspecified or not classified)	7
In-depth *case* *studies* of education phenomena in their sociological bearings	4

Comparative and International Education. Finally, among those schools, colleges, and departments of education that offer undergraduate courses in comparative and/or international education, six organizational formats predominate. The following table summarizes these approaches:[66]

Organization Of Content/Instructional Approach	% Of Respondents
"Structural" descriptions of and comparisons among, various national school systems among the less developed/developing/Third World countries and/or contrasts between "first/Second World" systems and "Third World" national systems.	30
Issue-oriented analysis in a comparative perspective (e.g., bilingualism, minority assimilation, access and attrition, etc.)	18
Development education; policy planning and development; educational problems of emergent nations	14
"Structural" descriptions of and comparisons among various national school systems (e.g., education in England, Germany, France, Soviet Union, United States, etc.) within developed countries	14

Concept-oriented analysis in a comparative perspective (aims, goals, pedagogy, administrative format, curricula, etc.)	10
"Other"	8
"Functional" analysis of schooling in a comparative context or from an international perspective (e.g., the institution of schooling as social control, cultural imperialism, etc.)	6

Introductory Foundational Courses

As previously noted, frequently a required introductory course to the study of professional education amounts to one and the same thing as a general "social foundations" course, the latter purporting to integrate several disciplinary perspectives. Considering the scope of possible content to be addressed, these courses typically display even greater diversity than do more specialized courses of a foundational nature. The following table illustrates in very broad terms half a dozen major apporaches:[67]

Organization Of Content/Instructional Approach	% Of Respondents
School and society, issues and trends (problems, movements, controversies, etc.) in education.	24
Introduction to education as a practical endeavor and as a field of study (descriptive overview), socialization and schooling, administration and governance, local-state-federal relations, legal issues and school law, supreme court decisions affecting schooling, teaching as a career and a profession, classroom discipline, teacher ethics, societal determinants of curricula, etc.	21

"Other"	17
Eclectic, inter-disciplinary approach to the study of education, e.g., segments organized by *disciplines*: history, philosophy, sociology, psychology, issues and trends, etc.	16
Social-intellectual criticism: societal determinants of education, school and the social/economic/political order, ideological movements, alternative governance models in schooling, etc.	8
Aims and objectives, methodologies, organization of schooling, trends and movements, issues and controversies, etc.	8
Sociological overview; social class stratification, socialization, political culture, schooling and socio-economic equality/mobility, bureaucratization, governance, etc.	6

The multiplicity of formats characteristic of introductory foundational courses is further illustrated by the content and organization of textbooks used in teaching such courses. Literally scores of texts are currently available, each differing considerably from the others. For illustrative purposes, reference will be made to the following nine titles, all of which are of recent vintage and have enjoyed widespread usage:

Arthur K. Ellis, John J. Cogan, and Kenneth R. Howey, *Introduction to The Foundations of Education* (Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, 1981)

Robert J. Havighurst and Daniel U. Levin, *Society and Education*, Fifth Edition (Boston: Allyn and Bacon, 1979)

John Jarolimek, *The Schools in Contemporary Society, An Analysis of Social Currents, Issues, and Forces* (New York: Macmillan, 1981)

Donald E. Orlosky, ed., Introduction to Education, (Columbus, Ohio: Charles E. Merrill, 1982)

Allan C. Ornstein and Daniel U. Levin, An Introduction to the Foundations of Education, Second Edition (Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1981)

Sandford W. Reitman, Education, Society, and Change, (Boston: Allyn and Bacon, 1981)

Kevin Ryan and James M. Cooper, Those Who Can Teach, Third Edition (Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1980)

Richard D. Van Scotter, Richard J. Draft, and John D. Haas, Foundations of Education, Social Perspectives (Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, 1979)

David A. Welton, Realms of Teaching, An Introduction to American Education (Chicago: Rand McNally, 1979)

The Ellis, Cogan and Howey volume opens with a discussion of the function and purpose of teaching, types of instruction, and common characteristics of those who elect to become teachers. This is followed by a section devoted to factors influencing job availability and salaries for teachers, types of teaching experiences, and popular attitudes toward teachers, and student and teacher rights and liabilities. Part 1 of the book ends with a descriptive overview of the work of the AFT and NEA, and an analysis of the distinction between "education" and "schooling."

Part 2 offers an overview of five philosophies of education' a brief summary of the history of education from Graeco-Roman antiquity up through the Renaissance and Reformation; and a similarly-abbreviated treatment of schooling from the colonial period in America up to the present. Another chapter is given over to societal expectations of schooling and the school's functions of cultural transmission, human development, the equalization of opportunity, and effecting social change.

A third section or part of the text gives a descriptive overview of how schools are organized at various levels; contrasting approaches to curricula and classroom management; patterns of administrative and financial administration of schooling at federal, state, and local levels; and concludes with chapters devoted to contemporary issues (finance, discipline, equal opportunity, bilingual education, busing, mainstreaming, technological innovation, sex and drug abuse, the back-to-basics movement), multicultural education, problems of accountability in education (including testing and assessment), and societal forces affecting school curricual. Section 4 discusses curriculum theory and practice, and the future state of the teaching profession.

The text by Havighurst and Levin, a very popular resource now in its fifth edition, is organized rather differently. Its 21 separate chapters are distributed throughout 5 parts or sections. In part 1, readers are introduced to such topics as education and the American social-class structure, schooling and socio-economic opportunity, the role of the college in the U.S. social system, mobility, and the interaction of schools with the social-class structure.

Part II deals with child-rearing in different social-class environments, the impact of the home environment upon children's cognitive development, the fate of low-status students in public schools, compensatory education, peer-group influences, and adolescent developmental behavior. Part III centers on urban education, treating such topics as urbanization, segregation, and city-school financing.

Part IV looks at education in relation to demographic and economic trends, the needs of minority students, cultural pluralism and social integration, and women. Part V examines the social characteristics of teachers, the teacher's multiple roles in the classroom and community, and the current status of the teaching profession.

Jarolimek's volume has 12 chapters. The first analyzes the dynamics of school-society relationships. Chapter 2 reviews the allegations of modern school critics. A third chapter looks at the various roles schools perform as social institutions. Chapter 4 is given over to race, ethnicity, and sex in relation to schooling; whereas chapter 5 discusses vocationalism and the world of work. The chapter following is devoted to equal educational opportunity.

Chapters 7 and 8 supply treatments of social status, power, and the influence of social, cultural and ethnic variables on schooling. Economic and political factors influencing school decision-making frame the next two chapters. Chapter 11 examines the role of organized teacher groups on educational policy; the concluding chapter takes up the question of managing educational change.

The introductory text edited by Orlosky is an anthology. Once again, there are four main parts or sections, each consisting of 4 or 5 separate essays. In Part I, readers are supplied an overview of teaching as a profession, with special attention given to historical and philosophical perspectives. Part II is concerned with the dynamics of classroom interaction and management. Part III looks to such issues as child development, educational alternatives, teaching exceptional children, and instructional resources and technology. Part IV addresses such topics as professionalism, curriculum development, field experiences, and the future of public education.

Ornstein and Levin's book covers much the same topics as the texts by Ellis, Cogan and Howey and by Havighurst and Levin: teaching as a profession, teacher education, accountability, and so on. Part II deals with the historical and philosophical foundations of education. Part III, "Social Foundations," considers social class, culture, race, educational achievement, and student peer group-influences upon learning. Part IV is devoted to questions concerning educational aims, curricula, school organization, desegregation, compensatory education, and "trends and issues in the 1980's" (e.g., multicultural education, mainstreaming, school finance reform, mastery learning, minimum competency teasting, and similar topics).

The third edition of Ryan and Cooper's popular text is organized around a series of questions: Why teach? What problems does the beginning teacher face? How do people become teachers? Why are knowledge and theory important in teaching? What skills and attitudes does the teacher need? What is a school? What is life in schools like? What is taught? How are schools governed and controlled? Is teaching a profession or a trade? What are the major issues and controversies in contemporary education? and Is there a job for you in education?

The book Foundations of Education: Social Perspectives by Van Scotter, Kraft and Haas yields up chapters on the history of education (traditional and revisionist views), various formal philosophies of education (Idealism, Realism, Pragmatism, Existentialism, etc., the politics of education (issues of power and control), economics and education, socialization in schools, the role of values in education, racism and ethnicity, sexism, school organization and structure, curricula, alternative schooling, teacher professionalism, issues and models of education for "global survival," and futurism in educational planning.

Reitman's Education, Society, and Change (1981), essentially a revision of an earlier work entitled Foundations of Education for Prospective Teachers (1977), is written, as the author's preface explains, "in the tradition of the social foundations calling upon the disciplines of sociology, social psychology, anthropology, economics, and including as well history and philosophy." Insights from these disciplines are "synthesized and interwoven throughout the text and serve as a backdrop to...educational concerns" (p. x). Among the many recent developments treated are public attitudes toward schools, reshifting youth values and expectancies, alternative schools and vouchers, neo-conservatism and the back-to-basics movement, secondary educational reform, new federal and state educational priorities--expecially mainstreaming of the handicapped--school violence and discipline, problems in financing public education, teachers' unions and collective bargaining, and teacher tenure.

Reitman's text emphasizes "the dynamics of current interpersonal, organization, and cultural factors that relate to education" (p. 18), with chapters based on the variant functions and roles of schooling in contemporary society, the historical development of U.S. public education, cultural lag and the "social context" of American education (e.g., the changing familial structure, institutional change and development, social stratification, peer-group values and behavior, and evolving human values). Separate chapters discuss major systems of educational philosophy and conflicting ideologies in education. Others take up the question of the structure of authority and control in formal education, the school as a distinctive "social system," teacher leadership in the classroom, and the relationship of social and edcuational change.

Welton's Realms of Teaching offers yet another approach. Part 1 on the "foundations" of American education is organized on a historical basis, emphasizing major developments in educational thought and practice since the 1920's. Part 2 treats finance and governance issues, the professional rights and responsibilities of teachers, and schooling from the student's perspective. Part 3 introduces curriculum planning, development, and evaluation; and ends with an overview of classroom management problems and educational prospects for the future.

Assuming such texts find widespread application in the teaching of undergraduate courses in the foundations of education, it appears almost impossible to offer very many defensible generalizations as to the actual content of instruction and how it is structured. Apparently, in about one-fourth of all cases, the approach taken is, first, to describe (and occasionally to analyze) selected issues and trends in modern schooling. These may or may not necessarily be set in some broader conceptual or interpretive context. Typically, the focus is upon the reciprocal relationship between society and the school as a social institution. In roughly the same percentage of cases, the intent, secondly, is to introduce the sweep and scope of education as a field of study, to present a broad overview of how schooling is organized, financed, and controlled; thirdly, to review movements and major controversies in education; and finally, to consider the nature of teaching as a career.

Sometimes, the foundational study of education is segmented into disciplinary perspectives, each offering a different way of looking at the phenomena under discussion (e.g., historical, philosophical, sociological, political, comparative, and so on). Oftentimes when this particular approach is pursued, little or no attempt is made to integrate or bring together all the separate treatments. In remaining cases, several other approaches are employed: social criticism, policy analysis, sociological description, and so forth *ad infinitum*. Overall, it may be fair to claim that *no* single body of subject-matter defines foundational coursework. Depending on how a course is conceived, all of education as a socio-cultural phenomenon could be taken as its province. Hence, except at the risk of being arbitrary and purely stipulative, it is virtually impossible to identify or designate a common body of knowledge for foundational studies in education.

A moment's reflection will suggest why this is necessarily the case. If, for example, philosophy of education is construed primarily as an *activity* or *process* of analysis, judgment, and interpretation rather than a definable body of assumptions, theories, or facts, then it follows that the evaluative, explanatory and analytic processes of philosophic inquiry can be applied to practically all educational phenoma. As the PES standards make plain, the skills and concepts involved can be used to address almost all educational concerns and issues.

Similarly a dynamic interpretation of history of education would seem to preclude its definition as a static assemblage of facts, names, and dates. While, admittedly, not all aspects of the historical record are equally important or relevant, the data can be treated in an almost infinite variety of ways, depending upon what specific questions frame the inquiry, the historiographical frame of reference or context used in selecting materials for consideration, and the thematic focus employed.

The same point applies inter alia to the comparative, the political, the economic, or the sociological study of education. Particularly with respect to undergraduate teacher education, the point of foundational studies is not to generate an independent body of knowledge about education so much as it may be to offer a set of alternative ways of looking at it in some broader context. One might very well cite the most common theories, concepts, and facts addressed within foundational courses, but such an enumeration would fall short of specifying a content all share in common. To the tidy-minded, the seemingly indeterminate nature of the foundations is somewhat offensive, or at least disquieting. Others argue that the scope of content is at once a major strength as well as a possible liability within the field.

The Actual Scope And Role Of The Foundational Component In Undergraduate Pre-Service Teacher Education

Heretofore, reliable empirical data on the scope of the foundational component in teacher education have been lacking. A recent national survey, however, yields a clearer indication of how foundational studies are actually organized and staffed, what courses are offered, what requirements are in force, and how foundational scholars view themselves and their work. Principal findings from this study included the following:

1. Wholly independent administrative units made up exclusively of faculty teaching courses in foundations of education are the exception rather than the rule. Even within larger schools, colleges, and departments of education (SCDE's), foundations faculty share departmental identity with colleagues teaching other kinds of courses. No readily recognizable patterns predominate; foundations faculty are equally likely to be conjoined administratively with any other area of academic or professional specialization in Education. The term "foundations" is used more than twice as commonly all other administrative designations combined (e.g., "educational studies" or "educational policy studies").
2. Numbers of faculty full-time equivalents (FTE's) in foundations vary greatly among SCDE's, ranging from less than a single FTE to 26 FTE's. On a percentage basis, an appreciable number engaged in undergraduate instruction in the area hold degrees in fields or areas other than those encompassed by the term "foundations."

3. The "typical" undergraduate pre-service teacher preparation program leading to initial certification requires less than two 3-semester-hour courses in foundations of education. The median hour-requirement is 3-semester-hours or its equivalent. Most commonly the foundational coursework component is satisfied by completion of an "Introduction to Education" course , a general "Social Foundations of Education" course, or an "Issues And Trends/School and Society"-type course. Next in order of frequency is a required course in educational philosophy.

4. Foundational coursework accounts for a very small part of the professional training most teacher-candidates receive. As a percentage of total semester-credit-hours required for a baccalaureate degree in education, foundations courses represent less than 4 percent of the whole. On the average, foundational courses comprise less than 16 percent of required coursework in professional education for elementary majors, exclusive of clinical experiences (31 hours is a norm). For secondary majors who typically are required to complete around 24 hours in professional education, foundational studies represent slightly less than one-fifth of the total. Again, a single 3-hour course in foundations of education in most cases would suffice to reflect the percentages cited.

5. In three out of every four SCDE's, students enroll in a single course in common in order to satisfy the foundational requirement. At larger institutions, students may select from upwards of two to five course alternatives.

6. Foundations faculty perceive themselves as enjoying good professional and personal relationships with colleagues in other sub-disciplines or areas

of Education; and, generally, they report support from faculty peers for the courses they teach in foundations of education. These generalizations apply with least force to large public SCDE's. They further report supportive relations with Deans, Chairs, or other administrative superordinates.

7. Foundations faculty view their greatest collective strengths to derive from their scholarly expertise or academic excellence, their pedagogical competence, and from the intrinsic importance or relevance of what they teach. Their greatest shared concerns are declining student enrollments, lack of opportunities for continuing professional development, and, to a much lesser extent, a suspicion that society in general (and/or the SCDE in particular) neither appreciates nor understands adequately the contribution of foundations of education to teacher preparation.

8. Foundations faculty identify closely with professional academically-based teacher education. Less than one-third are involved in undergraduate instruction aimed at the preparation of educators for non-school settings. Most expect their primary institutional role will remain tied to teacher education.

9. Faculty in foundations are inclined to believe their course are well-received by students, and that student attitudes toward such courses grow more positive and supportive as a result of exposure to instruction.

10. Persons teaching courses in the foundations of education tend to organize instruction around basic concepts and issues in education. Many favor an interdisciplinary or generalist approach which supercedes or transcends specific disciplines.

Less frequently do they attempt to structure courses so as to reflect directly the concepts, problems and concerns of teacher-educators in other areas. Comparatively few faculty identify closely with a cognate discipline such as history, philosophy, sociology, political science, and so on, except for academics specialists employed in large public SCDE's.

11. Almost half of all foundations faculty aim in their teaching at the promotion of broad theoretical understanding or "contextual" knowledge among students. About one-third seek to impart principles which, it is expected, can prove directive of educational policy and practice. Very few essay to instill any type of specific pedagogical expertise. The overwhelming majority view their instructional function as one of analysis rather than either simple description of educational phenomena or didactic advocacy of some partisan position.[68]

Especially pertinent for present purposes is the finding that students in teacher-education programs are required typically to complete only one foundational course. Quite frequently, this is either a general-purpose lower-level course introducing education as a professional field or a "social foundations" course in the sense previously discussed. Hence, in considering the rationale for including the foundations in teacher education, it is important to bear in mind that what is at issue is the propriety of including a single three-hour course (or its equivalent) among the eight or so courses usually required of secondary-education majors or the ten courses commonly demanded of elementary-education majors, not counting student teaching and other field-based experiences.

Elements Of A Rationale For Foundational Studies

A foundations specialist occupies an unenviable position. On one side his or her field is disparaged by so-called "real" academicians in the established disciplines for being derivate and somehow second-rate. Academic purists who distrust the professional-school concept are apt to scorn all coursework in education generally and those sub-specialties in particular that most closely reflect their own liberal disciplines. Furthermore, despite extensive training in content areas outside education, few who teach in foundational areas possess the credentials to be accepted as members of departments of sociology, history, philosophy, economics, or political science. Yet, historically, powerful pressures have been generated to encourage foundations teachers to look to those disciplines for canons of scholarship, research design, criteria for organizing courses, and, generally, for professional status.[69] (One might add, unfortunately, that many foundations teachers sometimes also borrow the traditional "read-recite" pedagogy so prevalent in liberal-arts colleges.)

On the other side, "educationists" are also sometimes suspicious of foundational scholars, and inclined to harbor reservations about whether their work offers any substantial contribution at all to teacher education. The list of complaints is endless. Foundations courses stand accused of faddism, abstractness, ideological bias, curricular isolation, and negativism. Many question whether the down-to-earth "practical" task of preparing teachers leaves room for speculation and "empty theorizing." Foundations people are attacked (sometimes with good reason) for lacking professional commitment to teacher education. Their courses are charged with failure to link theory with practice, or to demonstrate any palpable connection between scholarly analysis and the "real-life" problems teachers confront on a daily basis. Frequent complaints are that foundations courses are unrealistic, overly idealistic, or just plain impractical.

Contrariwise, recurrent criticism is that foundational coursework is _too_ critical of American education as it exists today. Many suspect that it is profoundly subversive. What many observers object to is that the foundations do _not_ begin by assuming a particular system of education is "natural" or inevitable or the best of all possible alternatives.[70] As Donald Warren observes,

> foundational courses highlight schools' critics but tend to ignore their advocates. Foundations faculty seem willing to entertain proposals to deschool society, charges that public schools are racist, sexist, and ethnocentric, and voucher plans that would weaken the tax base of public education. We describe schools as co-opted by the capitalist system and teachers as, at best, unwitting agents of majoritarian values given to obedience training. By emphasizing the failures of schools and teacher education, we are seen as delivering ammunition to those looking for excuses to cut education budgets and abolish programs. Disloyalty may be the most difficult charge confronting the Foundations.

While rejecting charges of disloyalty or subversion, most contemporary proponents of foundational studies in education respond by saying their role in teacher education has been misconstrued. A major function--if not, indeed, the primary function--of foundational inquiry _is_ criticism. Martin Levit, for example, differentiates among three generic approaches to the study of education. The first, which he terms "system-adaptive," carries the presumption that teacher trainees will adopt traditional roles, that they will learn to apply established principles and carry out tasks previously agreed upon in existing programs. The function of the foundations, accordingly, is to "describe" existing educational processes and institutions as objectively as possible. The stance reflected in instruction should be "neutral" with respect to the status quo. Arguably, this is a dominant presumption in most teacher-education circles. In the name of "hard-nosed realism," the challenge is taken to be one of conveying to prospective teachers a sense for the real world of public education and to prepare them to service the existing system.[72]

Commenting upon this perspective, Landon Peyer and Kenneth Zeicher note that a common conception of teacher preparation views it

> ...as existing to help students take on currently dominant teacher role, expectations and characteristics. Teacher preparation within this perspective is aimed at equipping students with the skills,

> dispositions, and competences necessary for the perpetuation of schools in their present form. Teacher preparation so conceived becomes a kind of vocational training. ...Within this vocational orientation, there is a tendency to assume a taken-for-granted posture with respect to both current school practice and educational programs that serve to train people to occupy the necessary occupational roles. The work of preservice teachers is, accordingly, often delimited to replicating current practice, or modifying such practice within certain prescribed limits. ...Teacher training, accordingly, is often felt to be a primarily apolitical, non-ideological practice, dominated by concerns for such matters as increasing student achievement, maintaining discipline and order in classrooms, or providing 'meaningful learning experiences.'[73]

As characterized by Levit, a second approach to the study and practice of education is what he terms "system-reform." As represented by those who oppose many of the structural features of present-day school and society, the intent is to provoke change, either radical external reform or ameliorative change from within the system. Proposals may be rather vague. They could be concerned with "establishing the need for societal reforms and for new values that promise to free individuals instead of coercing them into the conforming ways of a competitive and dehumanizing technological society." They might range from "educational preparation for socialiam and world government to the erasure of compulsory education and of authority based on status and expertise in the ways of a morbid society."[74] Whatever the particular proposals involved, the emphasis in research and instruction is upon building a case for certain preferred policies and not simply on studying and evaluating current usage.

Contrasting with both the system-adaptive approach and the radical or utopian bents of the system-reform approach is a third alternative, what Levit calls a "systems-evaluative" or "inquiry-oriented" model. His recommendation, one to which perhaps a majority of foundational specialists would give assent, is that foundational studies should focus primarily upon "the critical, comparative and comprehensive evaluation of socio-educational systems, educational theories and educational policies." Its primary purpose "is not to describe or prescribe operating roles and rules that exist or that should be adopted; it is to critically evaluate sets of educational roles and rules and the criteria used to accept or reject them."[75] In essence, Levit's description of the role of the foundations of education closely resembles the "critical" perspective cited in standards advanced by the American Educational Studies Association.

The distinctive contribution of foundational offerings, as many writers have emphasized, is the opportunity these afford for systematic critical reflection. Their task is to help teachers and administrators to monitor, appraise, modify, and otherwise make informed judgments about theory and practice in education. The alternative, Arnstine notes, is "habit, blind trial and error, and submission to the dictates of fashion."[76] Nash and Agne phrase the point as follows.

> The case must be made that, in addition to the need for applied courses, educators will be constantly drawn back to theoretical and philosophical considerations as they take their places in classrooms and administrative or counseling offices. Every profession is a complex amalgam of applied content, skills, and principles--all derived in part from theoretical areas in the arts, humanities, sciences, and social sciences. Effective teaching, counseling, and administrating require an ability to use theoretical bodies of knowledge as well as the practical wisdom acquired by experience. Educational practice often degenerates into staleness, boredom and routinized thought when social commitment and theoretical broadening of perspective dies.[77]

The function of foundational studies is not to impart any specific pedagogical expertise. They are not intended to equip students to cope with the day-to-day encounters of school practice. They cannot be "applied" in any direct or immediate sense; but this is not to concede they are necessarily "impractical" or dysfunctional within teacher-preparation programs. Foundational studies are neither irrelevant or extraneous. Their role rather, as another writer observes, is to lodge "a critical reservation within the narrowing focus that necessarily characterizes teacher preparation." The foundations, in other words, are intended to help the practitioner maintain the "critical distance" needed for an adequate assessment of practice.[78]

Again, foundational studies are supposed to help the educator think more clearly about the essential meaning of the work in which he or she is engaged. Without perspective, lacking a vantage point from which to scrutinize educational phenomena, the individual teacher becomes little more than an automaton, a functionary performing a series of tasks determined by others who are external to the immediate situation.[79] Several years ago Charles Silberman expressed a similar viewpoint. Teachers, he argued, require more than a knowledge of subject matter and some practical teaching experience prior to entering a classroom:

> They need knowledge about knowledge, about the ramifications of the subjects they teach, about how those subjects relate to other subjects and to knowledge--and life--in general. They need insights into their purposes as a teacher--why they are teaching what they are teaching, and how these purposes relate to the institutional setting of the school and to the values of the local community and the society at large...Most important, perhaps, they need to know that they need to know these things--they need to understand the kinds of questions their teaching will raise....[80]

Israel Scheffler, supporting the same point, has noted that foundational studies cannot directly improve teaching performance in the classroom. Yet even though they "do not directly enhance craftsmanship, they raise continually the sorts of questions that concern the larger goals, setting, and meaning of education practice"--the types of questions teachers must engage if they are to be taken seriously as professionals.[81] According to Lawrence Cremin, "Education is too significant and dynamic an enterprise to be left to mere technicians; and we might as well begin now the prodigious task of preparing men and women who understand not only the substance of what they are teaching but also the theories behind the particular strategies they employ to convey that substance."[82]

Ultimately, to the extent that the need for normative and critical perspective is acknowleged, weighty implications follow for teacher education--some of them political in nature. First, insofar as the belief prevails that teacher preparation is basically a vocational-technical form of training, then the rationale for housing programs in college and univeristies is seriously eroded. If teacher training is reducible to craft or apprenticeship-learning, then it most appropriately belongs under the control of local school districts. But if on the other hand it has a legitimate theoretical component not directly tied to practice, then it is a defensible academic enterprise.

Secondly, it may well prove to be the case that teachers' aspirations to become professionals will not be realized unless or until their preparatory training gains greater academic legitimacy. Without the sort of theory-based contextual understanding allegedly supplied by foundational studies, it is unlikely teacher education can attain that legitimacy.

Thirdly, there is growing appreciation for the fact that teacher education programs themselves are neither apolitical nor non-ideological.[83] All schooling, whatever its content or sturcture, including programs for educating teachers, is political. "It is political," two writers remark, "in that it either encourages or does not encourage persons to develop and use their critical capacities to examine the prevailing political, social, and cultural arrangements and the part their own acts (as teachers or non-teachers) play in sustaining or changing these arrangements." They further argue, "If the curriculum and faculty of teacher education programs or courses fail to encourage critical inquiry into everyday problems of teaching and learning, a de facto political position has been taken."[84]

The foundations of education, it is argued, serve to challenge the dominant sub-culture within teacher education and its tendency to reproduce existing patterns and arrangements. In encouraging prospective teachers to deal with the development, functions, and consequences of schooling, students necessarily must consider the social dimensions of education (both formal and informal), and in particular the role of schools within the social order. Inevitably, questions of an ideological and normative nature surface in any such inquiry. In this sense at least, the sort of criticism entailed--when it is successful--can be both "relevant" and "practice-centered."

References

[1] Harry S. Broudy, "The Role of the Foundational Studies in the Preparation of Elementary Teachers," Margaret Gillett and John A. Laska, eds., Foundation Studies in Education (Metuchen, New Jersey: Scarecrow Press, 1973), p. 149.

[2] Ibid., p. 150.

[3] Donald Warren, "What Went Wrong With The Foundations And Other off Center Questions?" Journal of Teacher Education 33 (May-June, 1982): 29.

[4] R. Freeman Butts, as cited in Charles J. Brauner, American Educational Theory (Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, 1964), p. 204.

[5] Christopher J. Lucas, "The Foundations Of Education In Teacher Preparation: A National Assessment," Educational Studies II (Winter, 1981): 353.

[6] See Christopher J. Lucas, "The Foundations Of Education Component In State Regulations Governing Teacher Preparation And Initial Certificaion," Educational Studies 10 (Spring, 1979): 20. Some terms appear more than once in the documents surveyed.

[7] Jonh P. Lipkin, "On the Nature and Purpose of Educational Foundations Studies," Journal of Teacher Education 21 (Winter, 1970): 486.

[8] AESA Task Force On Academic Standards, "Standards For Academic And Professional Instruction In Foundations of Educational Studies And Educational Policy Studies," Educational Studies 8 (Winter, 1978): 330.

[9] Ibid., p. 331.

[10] Ibid., p. 331.

[11] Ibid., pp. 331-332.

[12] Ibid., p. 333.

[13] Cited in Robert J. Nash and Russell M. Agne, "Beyond Marginality: A New Role for Foundations of Education," Journal of Teacher Education 33 (May-June, 1982): 3-4.

[14] Standards for Accreditation of Teacher Education (Washington: National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education, 1979), pp. 5-6.

[15] Nash and Agne, op. cit., p. 3.

[16] Alan H. Jones, "The Educational Foundations: An Interpretive, Normative, Critical Force in Teacher Education," Journal of Teacher Education 33 (May-June, 1982): 35.

[17] Ibid., p. 35.

[18] Maxine Greene, "Contexts, Connections, and Consequences: The Matter of Philosophical and Psychological Foundations," Journal of Teacher Education 32 (July-August, 1981): 32.

[19] Jennings L. Wagoner, "Should There Be Life After Death? The Case Of The Foundations Of Education," Educational Studies 7 (Spring, 1976): 2.

[20] Sol Cohen, "The History of the History of American Education, 1900-1976: The Uses of the Past," Harvard Educational Review 46 (August, 1976): 304.

[21] Wagoner, p. 2.

[22] See Lawrence A. Cremin, "The Recent development of the History of Education as a Field of Study in the United States," History of Education Journal 7 (Fall, 1955): 1-35.

[23] Donald Arnstine, "The Knowledge Nobody Wants: The Humanistic Foundations in Teacher Education," Educational Theory 23 (Winter, 1973): 5. See Lindley J. Stiles et. al., Teacher Education in the United States (New York: Ronald Press, 1960), p. 211 .

[24] Consult Michael B. Katz, "From Theory to Survey in Graduate Schools of Education," Journal of Higher Education 37 (1966): 325-331.

[25] The classic study of this period in the hisory of education fashions is Raymond Callahan, Education and the Cult of Efficiency (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1962).

[26] Paul H. Hanus, Adventuring in Education (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1937), p. 110.

[27] Katz, p. 329.

[28] See Harold Rugg, The Teacher of Teachers (New York: Harper, 1952), pp. 208-224; and Rugg, The Foundations of American Education (New York: Harcourt, Brace and World, 1947), pp. 578-579.

[29] Archibald W. Anderson, William O. Stanley, B. O. Smith, Kenneth D. Benne, and Foster MacMurray, *The Theoretical Foundations of Education: Historical, Comparative, Philosophical, and Social* (Urbana, Illinois: Bureau of Research and Service, 1951), pp. iv-v.

[30] Normand R. Bernier and Averile E. McClelland, "Foundations of Education: Toward A Generative Model," *Journal of Teacher Education* 33 (May-June, 1982): 10-11.

[31] Walter Feinberg, "Educational Studies And The Disciplines of Educational Understanding," *Educational Studies* 10 (Winter, 1980): 376.

[32] *Ibid*., p. 376.

[33] Bernier and McClelland, p. 14.

[34] David Conrad, Robert Nash and David Shiman, "Foundations of Education-The Restoration of Vision To Teacher Preparation," *Educational Theory* (Winter, 1973): 42-43.

[35] See Robert J. Nash, David A. Shiman, and David R. Conrad, "Can the Foundations of Education Survive? Grappling with Our Death Wish," *Journal of Teacher Education* 28 (January-February, 1977): 4.

[36] Conrad et. al,, "Foundations of Education-The Restoration of Vision To Teacher Preparation," p. 43.

[37] Robert J. Nash, David A. Shirman, And David R. Conrad, "The Foundations of Education: A Suicidal Syndrome?" *Teachers College Record* 78 (February, 1977): 300-301.

[38] *Ibid*., pp. 305-310.

[39] Arthur E. Bestor, *Educational Wastelands* (Urbana, Illinois: University of Illinois Press, 1953), pp. 144-145; and Bestor, *Restoration of Learning* (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1955), pp. 251-252.

[40] James D. Koerner, "Theory and Experience in the Education of Teachers," in *Strength through Reappraisal*, Sixteenth Yearbook of the American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education (Washington: National Education Association, 1963); quoted in James C. Stone and Frederick W. Schneider, eds., *Readings in the Foundations of Education* (New York: Thomas Y. Crowell, 1971), p. 72.

[41] James B. Conant, *The Education of American Teachers* (New York: McGraw-Hill, 1963), pp. 113, 121, 122.

[42] Ibid., pp. 126-127.

[43] See John L. Childs, "A Second Look at Dr. Conant's Report," Educational Forum 3 (March, 1967): 272ff; Theodore Kaltsounis and Jack L. Nelson, "The Mythology of Student Teaching," Journal of Teacher Education 14 (1968): 277-281; Archiblad W. Anderson et. al., "Discussion Report on 'The Education of American Teachers'," Educational Theory 15 (October, 1965): 335ff.; and Wayne J. Urban, "Social Foundations and the Disciplines," Teachers College Record 71 (December, 1969): 199-205.

[44] See Harry S. Broudy, "Conant on the Education of Teachers," Educational Forum 28 (January, 1964): 203.

[45] Harry S. Broudy, "Teaching-Craft or Profession?" Educational Forum 20 (January, 1956): 175-184.

[46] B. O. Smith, A Design For A School of Pedagogy (Washington: U.S. Department of education, 1980), p. 89. See also Smith, "On the Content of Teacher Education," in E. Hall et. al., eds., Exploring Issues in Teacher Education: Questions for Future Research (Austine, Texas: University of Texas Research and Development Center for Teacher Education, 1980).

[47] Smith, A Design For a School of Pedagogy, pp. 75-76.

[48] Ibid., pp. 23-24.

[49] John B. Lipkin, "On the Nature and Purpose of Educational Foundations Studies," Journal of Teacher Education 21 (Winter, 1970): 486-487.

[50] William O. Stanley, "The Social Foundations Subjects in the Professional Education of Teachers," Educational Theory 18 (1968): 232.

[51] Joseph Browde, "Educational Foundations: A Dynamic Approach," Comtemporary Education 45 (Fall, 1973): 16-18.

[52] James W. Wagener, "A New Role for Foundations Courses in Teacher Education," Journal of Teacher Education 21 (Winter, 1970): 492.

[53] Albert Grande, "In Limbo: Teacher Education and the Foundational Studies," Contemporary Education 43 (May, 1972): 342-343.

[54] R. Freeman Butts, "Reconstruction In Foundations Studies," Educational Theory 23 (Winter, 1973): 28-29, 32.

[55] Nicholas Appleton, "A Modular Approach to Foundations Of Education," Journal of Teacher Education 26 (Fall, 1975): 249-253.

[56] Moses Stambler, "A Systems Approach for a Disciplined Organization of Social Foundations of Education Courses," in Ayers Bagley, ed., Society of Professors of Education: Making Education More Relevant (Mineapolis: The Society, 1970), p. 61.

[57] Appleton, p. 250.

[58] Nash and Agne, p. 6.

[59] Landon E. Beyer and Kenneth M. Zeichner, "Teacher Training and Educational Foundations: A Plea for Discontent," Journal of Teacher Education 33 (May-June, 1982): 21.

[60] Walter Feinberg, "Educational Studies And The Disciplines Of Educational Understanding," Educational Studies 10 (Winter, 1980): 380, 382, 387.

[61] Philosophy of Education Society, "Standards for Academic and Professional Instruction in Philosophy of Education," Educational Theory 30 (Fall, 1980): 265.

[62] *Ibid.*, p. 266.

[63] Lucas, p. 356.

[64] *Ibid.*, p. 357.

[65] *Ibid.*, p. 358.

[66] *Ibid.*, p. 358.

[67] *Ibid.*, p. 355.

[68] *Ibid.*, pp. 359-361.

[69] Warren, p. 29.

[70] Beyer and Zeichner, p. 21.

[71] Warren, p. 29.

[72] See Martin Levit, "The Study of Education," Educational Theory 23 (Winter, 1973): 16-18.

[73] Beyer and Zeichner, p. 19.

[74] Levit, pp. 16-17.

[75] *Ibid.*, pp. 17-18.

[76] Arnstine, p. 14.

[77] Nash and Agne, p. 5.

[78] Warren, p. 28.

[79] Reitman, p. 13.

[80] Charles E. Silberman, Crisis In The Classroom (New York: Random House, 1970), pp. 490-491.

[81] Israel Scheffer, "University Scholarship and the Education of Teachers," as quoted in Silberman, p. 492.

[82] Lawrence A. Cremin, The Genius of American Education (Pittsburgh: University of Pittsburgh Press, 1965), p. 59.

[83] Note the discussion in Beyer and Zeichner, p. 21.

[84] H. Berlak and A. Berlak, Dilemmas of Shcooling: Teaching and Social Change (London: Methuen, 1981), p. 253.

Discussion Questions

1. How do the expectations and needs of novice teachers differ from those of experienced practicing teachers? For example, would it be valid to say most beginning teachers are primarily interested in acquiring immediate "survival skills" for the classroom, whereas classroom veterans are more amenable to theoretical discussion and analyses of education? To the extent this might be true, what implications follow--if any--for arranging the sequencing of the foundational components of a teacher-education program?
2. Is it realistic or desirable to expect a single course to introduce education as a field of inquiry and practice, while at the same time providing students with an adequate understanding of the myriad issues, trends, movements, and controversies prevalent in contemporary education?
3. Apart from whatever intrinsic interest or importance the history of education might possess, what might be the most obvious benefit or contribution of the historical study of education for an individual teacher? What specific insights, appreciations, or knowledge might the student be expected to acquire?
4. Identify, if possible, some of the insights a teacher might glean from a study of the sociology of education which could prove useful in diagnosing student's academic aptitudes and interests, in dealing with the special needs of exceptional learners, or in curriculum development. How, for example, might the study of social class status, socio-economic stratification, role models, ethnicity, authority, power, ideology, or mores and societal norms assist a teacher in his or her daily practice? How might the study of the economics or politics of education

shed light on such issues as collective bargaining, mainstreaming, teachers' unions, professionalism in education, and multi-cultural education?

5. What does it mean to "have" a philosophy of education? Can "real-world" teachers be categorized in terms of the educational philosophies to which they might give assent, e.g., realism, pragmatism idealism, existentialism, and so forth? Could teacher-educators themselves be so categorized? Does a classroom teacher need to understand the metaphysical, epistemological or axiological dimensions of teaching and learning? Or is this approach too artificial? Do practicing educators need to entertain questions about the nature of reality, knowledge and knowing, or standards for making ethical judgments in order to be effective teachers? Is philosophy of education a kind of after-the-fact intellectual "window dressing"? Can or should philosophical ideas in education actually "direct" or guide school practice? Is philosophy in education primarily a process and an activity of inquiry or should it be construed mainly as a body of knowledge consisting of the products of philosophic inquiry?
6. Why is it so frequently alleged that many students majoring in professional education--and practicing teachers themselves also--are "anti-intellectual," i.e., are indifferent to, or actually opposed to, cerebral activities and interplay of ideas? To what extent is this charge justified? Are any generalizations possible? Insofar as the allegation is warranted, what features of present-day teacher-education programs encourage such attitudes?
7. It is often claimed that teaching techniques are acquired most directly through models, by first-hand observation and imitation in actual classroom settings. If true, what can academically-based teacher training offer that

cannot be supplied more effectively through practice teaching and a kind of apprenticeship training? What is the best rationale for housing teacher education in schools, departments, and colleges of education?

8. If prospective teachers can allegedly benefit from studying about education from an historical, sociological or philosophic perspective, why create separate courses in such subjects? Why not simply require students to enroll in general courses in these disciplines? Alternatively, would it make more sense to have academic departments of history offer courses in the history of education, to lodge philosophy of education courses in philosophy departments, and so on? Why create separate courses? Is the issue important? Why or why not?
9. Besides technical competence, what are the characteristics of a "professional" in any field? What does "professionalism" in education imply for teacher education?
10. Ordinarily, the criterion for judging a theory is its predictive validity, i.e., does it work? In what sense then can one speak of sociological, historical, or philosophical "theory" in education? What standards are most appropriate for assessing the validity of theories that are not directly susceptible to experimental confirmation or falsification? What other functions do theories in education perform besides empirical prediction? How do such theories relate to policy and practice in education? Should prospective teachers be required to acquire a working knowledge of qualitative (non-quantitative) educational theory?

Bibliography

Periodical Literature:

Agostino, Robert V. "The Respectable Teaching of Historical Foundations," Educational Studies 9 (Summer, 1978): 151-157.

Appleton, Nicholas. "A Modular Approach To Foundations Of Education," Journal Of Teacher Education 26 (Fall, 1975): 249-253.

Arnstine, Donald. "The Knowledge Nobody Wants: The Humanistic Foundations In Teacher Education," Educational Theory 23 (Winter, 1973): 3-14.

Beckner, Weldon E. "Becoming Acquainted With Teaching--A Better Way," Journal Of Teacher Education 29 (September-October, 1978): 67-68.

Bernier, Normand R. and McClelland, Averile E. "Foundations of Education: Toward A Generative Model," Journal of Teacher Education 33 (May-June, 1982): 8-15.

Best, John Hardin. "Death, Taxes and Politics of Education: The Field of Educational Studies in Relation to Policy Studies," Educational Studies 9 (Winter, 1979): 391-399.

Beyer, Landon E. and Zeichner, "Teacher Training and Educational Foundations: A Plea for Discontent," Journal of Teacher Education 33 (May-June, 1982): 18-23.

Birkel, Lane F. "Analyzing Student Responses To Evaluations Of Foundations Of Education Courses," Teacher Educator 9 (Spring, 1974): 27-33.

Birkel, Lane F. "Foundational Studies And Teacher Education," Notre Dame Journal of Education 3 (Summer, 1972): 161-166.

______________. "Foundations Of Education For Undergraduates: When And Why," Kappa Delta Pi Record 10 (February, 1974): 88-89.

Blake, David W. "The Purposes And Nature of Comparative Education: The Contribution of I. L. Kandel," *Comparative Education* 18 (1982): 3-13.

Brimm, Jack L. and Fields, Joseph C. "Social Foundations Of Education Moves To The Community," *Tennessee Education* 9 (Fall, 1979): 18-21.

Broudy, Harry, "Teaching--Craft or Profession?" *Educational Forum* 20 (January, 1956): 175-184.

Browde, Joseph, Educational Foundations: A Dynamic Approach," *Contemporary Education* 45 (Fall, 1973): 16-18.

Butts, R. Freeman. "Reconstruction In Foundations Studies," *Educational Theory* 23 (Winter, 1973: 27-41.

Cohen, Sol. "The History of the History of American Education, 1900-1976: The Uses of the Past," *Harvard Educational Review* 46 (August, 1976): 298-330.

Conrad, David et. al. "Foundations Of Education--The Restoration Of Vision To Teacher Preparation," *Educational Theory* 23 (Winter, 1973): 42-55.

DeVitis, Joseph L. "Educational Policy Studies: Quest For Consensus?" *Educational Studies* 7 (Winter, 176-77): 345-350.

DeYoung, Alan J. "Classroom Technicians Versus Educational Analysts: How Future Teachers View The Debate," *Educational Studies* 10 (Summer, 1979): 189-196.

Dupuis, Adrian. "The Role Of Philosophy In Teacher Education," *Marquette University Education Review* 2 (Fall, 1971): 37-38.

Feinberg, Walter. "Educational Studies And The Disciplines Of Educational Understanding," *Educational Studies* 10 (Winter, 1980): 375-391.

Grande, Albert. "In Limbo: Teacher Education and the Foundational Studies," Contemporary Education 43 (May, 1972): 342-343.

Greene, Maxine. "Challenging Mystification: Educational Foundations In Dark times," Educational Studies 7 (Spring, 1976): 9-29.

______________. "Contexts, Connections, And Consequences, The Matter of Philosophical And Psychological Foundations," Journal of Teacher Education 32 (July-August, 1981): 31-37.

Hassenger, Robert, "Philosophical And Social Foundations Of Education," National Elementary Principal 53 (March-April, 1974): 58-61.

Holland, John et. al. "Social Foundations of Education," Educational Studies 1 (Fall, 1970): 31-37.

Howell, Thomas and Shimahara, Nobuo. "Educational Foundations: Contributions at Undergraduate Level," Teachers College Record 71 (December, 1969): 207-216.

James, H. Thomas. "Toward Improving The Education of Educators," Peabody Journal of Education 59 (January, 1982): 89-92.

Jones, Alan H. "The Educational Foundations: An Interpretive, Normative, Critical Force in Teacher Education," Journal of Teacher Education 33 (May-June, 1982): 35-37.

Kobayashi, Victor N. "A Certain Kind Of Madness: On The Foundations Of Education, Comparative And Otherwise," Educational Perspectives 18 (May, 1979): 16-19.

Laska, John A. "Current Progress in the Foundations of Education," Teacher College Record 71 (December, 1969): 180-182.

______________. "The Future Of Comparative Education: Three Basic Questions," Comparative Education Review 17 (October, 1973): 295-298.

Levit, Martin. "An Inquiry Approach for Educational Studies," AACTE Bulletin 24 (May-June, 1971): 1-6.

______________. "The Study Of Education," Educational Theory 23 (Winter, 1973): 15-26.

Lipkin, John P. "On The Nature And Purpose Of Educational Foundations Studies," Journal of Teacher Education 21 (Winter, 1970): 486-488.

Lucas, Christopher J. "The Foundations Of Education Component In State Regulations Governing Teacher Preparation And Initial Certification," Educational Studies 10 (Spring, 1979): 1-29.

______________________. and Cockriel, Irvin W. "The Foundations Of Education In Teacher Preparation: A National Assessment," Educational Studies 11 (Winter, 1981): 337-363.

Lyons, Raymond. "Economics Of Education," International Review of Education 25 (1979): 415-432.

McDowell, David W. "The Comparative Imperative For The Social Foundations Of Education Of Prospective Teachers," Educational Studies 8 (Fall, 1977): 231-239.

Miller, Steven I. "Defining Educational Policy Studies As A Field," Educational Studies 12 (Summer, 1981): 119-124.

Nash, Robert J. and Agne, Russell M. "Beyond Marginality: A New Role For Foundations Of Education," Journal of Teacher Education 33 (May-June, 1982): 2-7.

______________. et. al. "Can The Foundations Of Education Survive? Grappling With Our Death Wish," Journal Of Teacher Education 28 (January-February, 1977): 4-7.

______________________. "The Foundations Of Education: A Suicidal Syndrome," TEachers College Record 78 (February, 1977): 299-310.

Newsome, George L. "Social Foundations of Education: Where Do They Stand?" Educational Philosophy and Theory 3 (1971): 23-24.

Nordenbo, Sven Erik. "Philosophy Of Education In The Western World: Developmental Trends During The Last 25 Years," International Review of Education 25 (1979): 433-459.

Ozman, Howard. "College Courses In Social Foundations," Education 92 (November-December, 1971): 2.

Pietig, Jeanne. "Is Foundations of Education Discipline?" Educational Studies 6 (Spring/Summer, 1975): 1-12.

Reeves, F. W. "'Forms' and 'Fields'," Educational Studies 2 (October, 1976): 237-249.

Reid, William A. "Schools, Teachers, And Curriculum Change: The Moral Dimension Of Theory-Building," Educational Theory 29 (Fall, 1979): 325-336.

Schlechty, Philip C. and Morrison, James L. "The Role Of The Social Scientist In The School Of Education," Educational Studies 8 (Fall, 1977): 241-252.

Shapiro, Phyllis P. "Vicarious Experiences In Teacher Education--A Closer View," Teacher Educator 7 (Fall, 1971): 26-28.

Shields, James J. "Foundations of Education: Relevance Redefined," Teachers College Record 71 (December, 1969): 187-189.

Shimbori, Michiya. "Sociology Of Education," International Review Of Education 25 (1979): 393-413.

Simmons, John S. "The Development Of A Relevant Course In Social Foundations For English Teachers," English Education 11 (May, 1980): 228-232.

Smith, Joan K. and Hichman, Roy D. "The Impact Of A Foundations Of Education Course On Attitudes: Results Of A Longitudinal Study," Educational and Psychological Measurement 38 (Fall, 1978): 761-770.

Spencer, Thomas E. "The Foundations Approach To Education," Education 93 (September-October, 1972): 88-93.

Stanley, William O. "The Social Foundations Subjects in the Professional Education of Teachers," Educational Theory 18 (1969): 232.

Strain, John Paul, et. al. "General Foundations Of Education," Educational Studies 1 (Fall, 1970): 5-11.

Suchodolski, Bogdan. "Philosophy And Education," International Review of Education 25 (1979): 347-366.

Travers, Paul. "On The Value Of An Introductory Course In Professional Education," Kappa Delta Pi Record 15 (December, 1978): 48-49.

Tuman, Myron. "Performance-Based Teacher Education: A Curriculum In Search Of A Foundation," Contemporary Education 52 (Summer, 1981): 198-202.

Urban, Wayne J. "Social Foundations and the Disciplines," Teachers College Record 71 (December, 1969): 199-205.

Wagener, James W. "A New Role For Foundations Courses In Teacher Education," Journal Of Teacher Education 21 (Winter, 1970): 489-493.

Wagoner, Jennings L. Should There Be Life After Death? The Case Of The Foundations Of Education," Educational Studies 7 (Spring, 1976): 1-7.

Warren, Donald. "What Went Wrong With The Foundations And Other Off Center Questions?" Journal of Teacher Education 23 (May-June, 1982): 28-30.

Williams, Jack E. "They Train Lions, Don't They?" Journal of Teacher Education 33 (May-June, 1982): 31-34.

Williams, William G. "Does The Educational Past Have A Future?" Kappa Delta Pi Record 11 (April, 1975): 103-104, 121.

ERIC Documents:

Arnstine, Donald. *The Humanistic Foundations In Teacher Education* (ED058154), 1972.

Birkel, Lane F. *Student Attitudes Toward Educational Foundations Studies* (ED097306), 1975.

Carr, William G. *Collecting My Thoughts* (ED199196), 1980.

Christensen, James E. et. al. *A "Knowledgeable" Approach To Organizing A College Of Education* (ED129775), 1973.

DeVitis, Joseph L. *Educational Policy Studies: Quest For Consensus* (EDii3315), 1975.

Faure, Edgar, et. al. *Learning To Be: The World Of Education Today And Tomorrow* (ED070736), 1972.

Haberman, Martin. *The Legacy Of Teacher Education, 1980-2000* (ED212575), 1981.

Lawson, Robert F. *Discrimination And Integration In The Foundations Of Education* (ED075343), 1972.

Levit, Martin. *The Study Of Education* (ED053084), 1971.

Nash, Paul. *The Major Purposes Of Humanistic And Behavioral Studies In Teacher Education* (ED053085), 1971.

Rindone, Richard C. *A Factor Analysis Of The Education Foundations "Education Scale"* (ED086745), 1973.

Schwanke, Dean. *Curriculum Development In Teacher Education* (EJ254443), 1981.

Soltis, Jonas F. *Philosophy Of Education: Retrospect And Prospect* (ED111702), 1975.

Stambler, Moses. *A System Approach For A Disciplined Organization Of A Social Foundations Of Education Course* (ED076448), 1970.

Steiner, Elizabeth. Educology; Its Origin And Future (ED141201), 1977.

Sulton, Kenneth R. and Kofoid, Charles M. A Generic Clarifying Function Of Philosophy Of Education (EDo80449), 1970.

Swift, D. F. The Sociology Of Education: Introductory Analytical Perspectives (ED051061), 1969.

Taylor, William. Research Perspectives In Education (ED086234), 1973.

Tostberg, Robert E. On "Educational Theory" (ED083130), 1973.

TASK FORCE ON ACADEMIC STANDARDS
AMERICAN EDUCATIONAL STUDIES ASSOCIATION

COCHAIRPERSONS

Donald R. Warren,
University of Illinois at Chicago Circle

Joseph L. DeVitis,
University of Tennessee at Martin

MEMBERS

Barbara Finkelstein
University of Maryland

Alan H. Jones
Michigan Conference—American Association of University Professors

Glorianne Leck
Youngstown State University

J. Don Reeves
Wake Forest University

C. J. Schott
The University of Lethbridge

William Schubert
University of Illinois at Chicago Circle

Marie Wirsing
University of Colorado at Denver

Additional copies of these standards may be ordered at the following rates: 1-10 copies, $.30 each; 11-50 copies, $.25 each; more than 50 copies, $.20 each. If remittance does not accompany order, $1.00 will be added for billing. Send orders to:

Educational Studies
107 Quadrangle
Iowa State University
Ames, Iowa 50011

Publication of the AESA Standards was made possible by funds provided by:

WAKE FOREST UNIVERSITY
UNIVERSITY OF ILLINOIS AT CHICAGO CIRCLE

STANDARDS
FOR ACADEMIC AND PROFESSIONAL INSTRUCTION IN FOUNDATIONS OF EDUCATION, EDUCATIONAL STUDIES AND EDUCATIONAL POLICY STUDIES*

AESA TASK FORCE ON ACADEMIC STANDARDS

From: Educational Studies 8 (Winter, 1978): 329-342.

PREAMBLE

The American Educational Studies Association was established in 1968 as an international learned society for scholars and educational practitioners who share interests in the field of study generally identified as the Foundations of Education. In addition to educational administrators, teachers, publishers, and editors, members include students, teaching faculty, and research scholars representing such diverse areas of study as educational history, philosophy, psychology, sociology, anthropology, and economics; comparative and international education; curriculum; and in recent years educational studies and educational policy studies.

The Standards for Academic and Professional Instruction were constructed by the AESA Task Force on Academic Standards on the basis of wide and systematic consultation with Association members and other educational scholars and practitioners. They provide rationales and evaluation criteria for Foundations of Education study in graduate and undergraduate programs, in-service training for educational practitioners, and professional development of faculty. In recent years Foundations of Education faculty at some institutions have reorganized their departments and/or programs around Educational Studies or Educational Policy Studies. On other campuses, new academic units, interdepartmental research centers, and/or programs in Educational Studies or Educational Policy Studies have emerged independently of the Foundations of Education. In relating evaluation standards to instruction in Educational Studies and Educational Policy Studies, in addition to Foundations of

---

*THE STANDARDS WERE ADOPTED BY THE EXECUTIVE COUNCIL OF THE AMERICAN EDUCATIONAL STUDIES ASSOCIATION ON NOVEMBER 4, 1977

Education, the American Educational Studies Association acknowledges the kinship and similarity of purpose and rationale shared by these three areas of study. They represent the predominant academic and professional focus of Association members. In the pages that follow, the term "foundational studies" is frequently employed as an abbreviated reference to academic and professional instruction in these three areas of study.

The Standards are addressed in part to evaluation criteria published by national, regional, and state accreditation agencies, which typically prescribe instruction in humanistic studies and the behavioral sciences for graduate and undergraduate programs in education. They also respond to criteria advocated by state departments of education, local educational agencies, teacher centers, and teacher organizations. For the most part, these criteria provide only general directions for instruction in Foundations of Education, Educational Studies, and Educational Policy Studies. Needed are more detailed indications of: 1) the goals and content of foundational studies; 2) the qualifications of instructional personnel for foundational studies; 3) the extent to which required foundational studies are to be interdisciplinary; 4) the proportion of any given program to be devoted to foundational studies; 5) the roles of field experience in foundational studies; and 6) the criteria for assessing such field experience. It is particularly important to affirm clearly the important role played by the humanities in preparing educational professionals and to correct the failure of accreditation criteria to distinguish between the social and behavioral sciences in foundational studies. The AESA Standards respond to these needs. For example, they emphasize that instruction in the behavioral sciences, usually represented by foundational studies in Educational Psychology, is not an acceptable substitute for foundational studies in the humanities and the social sciences.

DEFINITION OF THE FOUNDATIONS OF EDUCATION

The Foundations of Education refers to a broadly-conceived field of study that derives its character and fundamental theories from a number of academic disciplines, combinations of disciplines, and area studies: history, philosophy, sociology, anthropology, religion, political science, economics, psychology, comparative and international education, educational studies, and educational policy studies.

From its origin in the 1930s, Foundations of Education has been subjected to a variety of interpretations and approaches. There are those who have promoted the idea that Foundations of Education should be assembled around educational issues, using the issues as curriculum-selecting and curriculum-organizing principles. Some have insisted that interdisciplinary and generalist concerns should supercede the commitments of Foundations of Education scholars to specific disciplines. Others have held to the priority of close disciplinary ties for Foundations of Education scholars. Some have promoted the desirability of curriculum liaisons between Foundations of Education scholars and teacher-educators in other fields, for example, administration, counseling and guidance, urban education, and curriculum and instruction. Still others have argued for the establishment of working ties between Foundations of Education scholars and community groups, and for involvement in areas of concern that go beyond the schooling enterprise. At the present time there are distinguished advocates for all these approaches.

The American Educational Studies Association takes the official position of supporting a diversity of Foundations of Education arrangements in relation to academic, teacher-education, and community groups. This position is based on the belief that an overarching and profoundly important academic and professional purpose unifies persons who identify with the various approaches to Foundations of Education, namely, *the development of interpretive, normative, and critical perspectives on education, including non-schooling enterprises*. There is, moreover, a shared contemporaneous orientation among Foundations of Education scholars — a deep concern for present circumstances, events, and conditions. In responding to the social issues and crises of the times, Foundations of Education scholars maintain a professional and intellectual tradition which was initiated in the 1930s.

The interpretive, normative, and critical perspectives developed through studies in the Foundations of Education are interrelated and can be characterized as follows:

1. The *interpretive* perspectives, using theories and resources developed within the humanities and the social and behavioral sciences, assist students in examining and explaining education within differing contexts. Foundational studies promote analyses of the meaning, intent, and effects of educational institutions, including schools. Educational thought and practice inevitably reflect particular contexts and beliefs. They can be perceived differently from various historical, philosophical, cultural, and social class perspectives. Education, whether in the form of schooling or some other arrangement, thus cannot be understood merely in terms of its present and immediately visible

characteristics. Understanding follows from attempts to interpret educational thought and practice within their special contexts and to translate them from one perspective to another. This deeper level of understanding is required of scholars who expect to increase knowledge about education and of practitioners committed to the delivery or improvement of educational services. The effectiveness of both kinds of professionals depends fundamentally on their intelligent comprehension of educational thought and practice. A major task of foundational studies is to provide the resources, incentives, and skills students require in performing the interpretive functions.

2. The *normative* perspectives assist students in examining and explaining education in light of value orientations. Foundational studies promote understanding of normative and ethical behavior in educational development and recognition of the inevitable presence of normative influences in educational thought and practice. Foundational studies probe the nature of assumptions about education and schooling. They examine the relation of policy analysis to values and the extent to which educational policymaking reflects values. Finally, they encourage students to develop their own value positions regarding education on the basis of critical study and their own reflections.

3. The *critical* perspectives assist students in examining and explaining education in light of its origins, major influences, and consequences. Foundational studies promote critical understanding of educational thought and practice, and of the decisions and events which have shaped them, in their various contexts. These multi-dimensional modes of analysis encourage students to develop inquiry skills, question educational assumptions and arrangements, and subject them to critical review. In particular, the critical perspectives provided through foundational studies enable students to examine equality and inequality in the distribution of educational opportunity and outcome. They promote understanding of past and present patterns of exclusion in education, the causes of exclusion and inequality, and the educational needs and aspiration of excluded minorities. Finally, foundational studies encourage the development of policymaking perspectives and skills in searching for resolutions to educational problems and issues.

Foundational study of the interpretive, normative, and critical perspectives within education relies heavily on the resources and methodologies of the humanities, particularly history and philosophy, and the social and behavioral sciences. Its primary objective is to sharpen students' abilities to examine and explain educational proposals, arrangements, and practices and to develop a disciplined sense of policy-oriented educational responsibility. For foundational studies, focus and emphasis fall on education broadly defined and not merely on schools. They encourage knowledge and understanding of education historically and philosophically and in view of its social, economic, and political relations.

A common focus of attention on education differentiates Foundations of Education scholars from academicians in the liberal arts and sciences. Although the nature of Foundations of Education presupposes collaboration with scholars in the liberal arts and sciences, sound programs require faculty who are qualified as Foundations of Education scholars.

ASSESSMENT OF FOUNDATIONS OF EDUCATION PROGRAMS

North American colleges and universities presently are responding to a distinctive climate of accountability. This climate, representing both a movement and a cluster of associated ideas, insists on educational programs that are designed to reflect competency-based learning expectations and to achieve explicitly stated behavioral objectives.

The American Educational Studies Association, exercising the interpretive, normative, and critical functions of its membership, herein calls attention to the implications of mandated competency-based education. Such a policy automatically establishes a given normative attitude of educational practitioners; it universalizes a single standard of presumed correctness. The imposition of any single intellectual outlook and associated behavior raises grave questions relative to education in a democratic society. With respect to Foundations of Educations, Educational Studies, and Educational Policy Studies, in particular, attention is directed to the interpretive, normative, and critical functions of these related fields of study. To formulate and assess Foundations of Education programs within a competency-based frame of reference, as a matter of education policy, would undermine the basic rationale of this academic and professional field—the free and open inquiry into *all* normative issues; the unfettered questioning of what is, and what ought to be. More fundamentally, such a policy would severely weaken the essential contribution of foundational studies to the preparation of educational professionals.

The AESA proposes that the formulation of program objectives for Foundations of Education, Educational Studies, and Educational Policy Studies, and the means of assessing them, be matters that are properly reserved to the professional and scholarly judgments of qualified faculty members operating within the settings of their respective colleges and universities, utilizing the Standards set forth in this document.

PURPOSES OF THE AESA STANDARDS

Standards have been developed for seven critical program areas in foundational studies. Their underlying assumption is that there is a definite correlation between professional and scholarly qualifications, judgment, and competencies, even though the last cannot appropriately be reduced to a prescribed set of behaviors, or to a predetermined level of performance. Each of the seven standards provides a broad framework and/or conditions in which the desired professional qualifications can be met. Specific purposes for the individual standards are as follows:

Initial Teacher Certification. Standard one seeks to ensure at least a minimum foundational studies component in initial teacher certification programs as a disciplined basis for developing interpretive, normative, and critical perspectives on education.

Professional Development of Educational Practitioners and Field Personnel. Standard two seeks to ensure that instruction in Foundations of Education, Educational Studies, or Educational Policy Studies is a part of in-service professional development programs and that such instruction is staffed by appropriately qualified faculty.

Non-Foundations Graduate Degrees and Programs in Education. Standard three seeks to ensure at least a minimum foundational studies component in all graduate programs offered by departments, schools, and colleges of education in order that candidates specializing in other fields have a disciplined basis for developing interpretive, normative, and critical perspectives on education.

Joint Graduate Degrees and Programs. Standard four seeks to ensure common general qualifications in foundational studies among candidates in graduate programs jointly controlled by faculty in Foundations of Education, Educational Studies, or Educational Policy Studies and faculty in other academic units.

Masters and Educational Specialist Degrees and Programs. Standard five seeks to ensure common general qualifications among candidates in masters and educational specialist programs in Foundations of Education, Educational Studies, or Educational Policy Studies to promote sufficient preparation to exercise the interpretive, normative and critical functions.

Preparation of Faculty. Standard six seeks to ensure common general qualifications among persons seeking the doctorate in Foundations of Education, Educational Studies, or Educational Policy Studies, whatever differences in specialization and emphases might otherwise be encouraged in relation to the foundational disciplines, combinations of disciplines, and area studies.

Professional Development of Faculty. Standard seven seeks to promote formal and informal post-doctoral studies among persons engaged in Foundations of Education, Educational Studies, or Educational Policy Studies as a necessary factor in maintaining professional qualifications.

The Standards tend to quantify the bases for verifying instruction in foundational studies. Referring in some sections to courses and units of instruction, they identify proportions of programs to be devoted to work in the Foundations of Education, Educational Studies, or Educational Policy Studies. Their ultimate purpose, however, is to promote quality instruction and learning in foundational studies, to guarantee to the extent possible that students have opportunities to acquire interpretive, normative, and critical perspectives on education through rigorous study and supervised field experiences. While a variety of approaches is possible, that objective provides the fundamental criterion for assessing fundational studies.

THE STANDARDS

I

Interpretive, Normative, and Critical Studies Component of Initial Teacher Certification

STANDARD I:

At least one-sixth of the professional preparation leading to initial teacher certification is to be devoted to humanistic and social foundational studies which promote the development of interpretive, normative, and critical perspectives on education. It is assumed that the program will require additional studies in the behavioral foundations of education.

This standard is addressed to criteria of accreditation agencies that prescribe instruction in humanistic and behavioral studies in education within the professional preparation component of each curriculum for prospective teachers. It acknowledges the basic distinction between the social and behavioral sciences and does not intend to establish instructional guidelines for the latter. For candidates in initial teacher certification programs, humanistic and social foundational studies contribute directly to the development of interpretive, normative, and critical perspectives on educational arrangements, practices, and discourse. They focus on the content and context of issues and problems that are fundamental to education, regardless of the candidate's eventual area of specialization. The general objectives of these foundational studies are to introduce students to interpretive uses of knowledge germane to education and to establish a basis for life-long learning through normative and critical reflection on education within its historical, philosophical, cultural, and social contexts.

Instruction in the interpretive, normative, and critical perspectives on education should reflect and serve the rationale and goals of the professional teacher preparation program. No particular organization or format is specified. Learning may be structured around aspects of the school-society relation, issues in educational policy, or particular disciplines, e.g., the history, philosophy, and sociology of education. Field experiences designed and supervised in collaboration with educational practitioners are appropriate components of foundational studies when those experiences contribute to students' abilities to interpret and communicate the content and context of educational thought and practice. This standard recognizes the importance of such areas of study as educational psychology, curriculum and instruction, educational administration, and pedagogical methods within professional teacher preparation programs. However, instruction in these areas is not an acceptable substitute for humanistic and social foundational studies.

The foundational component of the professional preparation program is to be developed and conducted or supervised by persons who meet the qualifications of standard six. As a rule, these faculty members will be identified with the Foundations of Education, Educational Studies, or Educational Policy Studies. They are expected to maintain collaborative relations with colleagues in other academic units of the department, school, or college of education and with educational practitioners and field personnel.

II

Professional Development of Educational Practitioners and Field Personnel in Interpretive, Normative, and Critical Studies

STANDARD 2:

At least one-sixth of the continuing, in-service preparation of educational practitioners and field personnel is to be devoted to foundational studies which promote the development of interpretive, normative, and critical perspectives on education.

The professional development of educational practitioners and field personnel invariably requires foundational studies that promote careful and rigorous re-interpretations of their professional and educational experiences. Such in-service instruction may focus on educational issues, themes in the school-society relation, selected educational policies, or particular disciplinary studies in, e.g., the history, philosophy, or sociology of education. Whether offered on campus or in community settings, foundational studies for educational practitioners and field personnel are expected to assist directly and substantially in their continued development of interpretive, normative, and critical perspectives on educational arrangements, practices, and discourse. Planned and evaluated in collaboration with appropriate practitioners and field personnel, in-service instruction in foundational studies is to be offered by faculty qualified under standard six.

III

Interpretive, Normative, and Critical Studies Component of Non-Foundations Graduate Degrees and Programs in Education

STANDARD 3:

At least one-sixth of masters and doctoral degree programs in Education specializations other than Foundations of Education, Educational Studies, and Educational Policy Studies is to be devoted to humanistic and social foundational studies which promote the development of interpretive, normative, and critical perspectives on education. It is assumed that the programs will require additional studies in the behavioral foundations of education.

This standard is addressed to instructional criteria of accreditation agencies that prescribe humanistic and behavioral studies as components of all graduate degree programs in education. Candidates seeking masters and doctoral degrees in education require informed interpretive, normative, and critical perspectives on educational arrangements, practices, and discourse. At levels appropriate to masters or doctoral programs, foundational instruction exposes students to research and field experiences that promote their knowledge and understanding of the content and context of fundamental issues and themes in education. Faculty in institutions that include educational psychology among foundational studies should note that instruction in the behavioral sciences alone cannot satisfy this standard. Rather, standard three is addressed specifically to instruction in humanistic and social foundational studies. It assumes that additional studies in the behavioral sciences are required. Instruction intended to satisfy this standard is offered by faculty typically associated with the Foundations of Education, Educational Studies, or Educational Policy Studies who meet the qualifications stipulated under standard six.

IV

Joint Graduate Degrees and Programs Involving Foundations of Education, Educational Studies, and Educational Policy Studies

STANDARD 4:

At least two-fifths of joint masters or doctoral programs involving foundational studies is to be devoted to instruction

> **(including research projects, field experiences, internships, and theses) in Foundations of Education, Educational Studies, and/or Educational Policy Studies. Such instruction includes preparation in at least three of the following disciplines or areas of study: history of education, philosophy of education, sociology of education, religion and education, anthropology and education, politics of education, economics of education, educational psychology, comparative and international education, educational studies, and educational policy studies.**

At a growing number of institutions of higher education, joint graduate programs have been established involving faculty in Foundations of Education, Educational Studies, or Educational Policy Studies.* Such joint programs can prepare individuals for college and university faculties and for academic and administrative positions within community colleges, public and private schools, research bureaus, religious institutions and public and private service agencies. In these joint programs, instruction in foundational studies is at a level substantially beyond that required in initial teacher certification programs and includes preparation in at least three of the following disciplines or areas of study: history of education, philosophy of education, religion and education, sociology of education, anthropology and education, politics of education, economics of education, educational psychology, comparative and international education, educational studies and educational policy studies. Such instruction is designed to advance students' abilities to interpret and communicate the content and context of issues and themes treated in foundational studies. To the extent appropriate to the doctoral or masters level, students are to produce demonstrable evidence of disciplined writing, acquire skill and understanding in appropriate research methodologies, and participate in field experiences supportive of program goals. Field experiences, including internships, are to be planned, supervised, and evaluated collaboratively by faculty qualified under standard six and appropriate field personnel.

---

*ILLUSTRATIVE AREAS OF EMPHASIS OR CONCENTRATION IN JOINT PROGRAMS ARE: ADULT EDUCATION; COUNSELING AND GUIDANCE; INSTRUCTION AND CURRICULUM; FUTURISTICS STUDIES; MULTICULTURAL EDUCATION; URBAN EDUCATION; MINORITY GROUP PROBLEMS; BILINGUAL EDUCATION; TEACHING ENGLISH AS A SECOND LANGUAGE; LINGUISTICS; READING; EDUCATIONAL PLANNING AND MANAGEMENT; EDUCATIONAL ADMINISTRATION; EDUCATIONAL TECHNOLOGY; LIBRARY MEDIA; SPECIAL EDUCATION; ALTERNATIVE EDUCATION. EARLY CHILDHOOD EDUCATION; RESEARCH. MEASUREMENT AND EVALUATION; MUSEUM EDUCATION; ENVIRONMENTAL SCIENCES; COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT; SOCIAL SERVICES; PUBLIC POLICY; PUBLIC HEALTH; MENTAL HYGIENE; COMPUTER PROGRAMMING; HUMAN RELATIONS; INDUSTRIAL AND LABOR RELATIONS; JOURNALISM; LAW; LITERATURE; THEATER; AND THE ARTS

V

Preparation of Candidates in Masters and Educational Specialist Degrees and Programs in Foundations of Education, Educational Studies, and Educational Policy Studies

STANDARD 5:

As a minimum requirement, three-fifths of masters and educational specialist degrees and programs in Foundations of Education, Educational Studies, or Educational Policy Studies is to be devoted to instruction in at least three of the following disciplines or areas of study: history of education, philosophy of education, religion and education, sociology of education, anthropology and education, politics of education, economics of education, educational psychology, comparative and international education, educational studies, and educational policy studies. The programs are designed, directed, and evaluated by faculty qualified under standard six.

This standard is addressed to masters and educational specialist degree programs that prepare persons interested in developing interpretive, normative, and critical perspectives on educational arrangements, practices, and discourse. The primary professional focus of the programs is to improve the general effectiveness of school professionals, including teachers and administrators. The programs can also prepare persons for a variety of roles in government, business, industry, voluntary agencies, and the arts — and, of course, for more advanced study in Foundations of Education, Educational Studies, or Educational Policy Studies.

VI

Preparation of Faculty in Foundations of Education, Educational Studies, and Educational Policy Studies

STANDARD 6:

Doctoral programs in Foundations of Education, Educational Studies, or Educational Policy Studies offer concentrated, advanced preparation in at least one of the following disciplines or areas of study and general preparation in at least two others: history, philosophy, sociology, politics, and economics of education; religion and education; anthropology and education; educational psychology; comparative and international education;

> **educational studies; and educational policy studies. The minimum number of academic staff in Foundations of Education, Educational Studies, or Educational Policy Studies in institutions offering doctoral degrees in these specializations should be the full-time equivalency of at least five faculty members who meet the qualifications of this standard and represent concentrations in at least three of the disciplines or areas of study listed above.**

Doctoral programs preparing individuals whose interests are in developing interpretive, normative, and critical perspectives on educational arrangements, practices, and discourse may be designated as programs in Foundations of Education, Educational Studies, or Educational Policy Studies. The distinctive focus of the programs is the interpretive, normative, and critical examination of education through the framework of the following disciplines or areas of study: history, philosophy, religion, sociology, anthropology, political science, economics, psychology, comparative and international education, educational studies, and educational policy studies.

There are three alternative designs providing general direction for such programs:

(1) In Foundations of Education, interpretive, normative, and critical perspectives are developed through concentration on the paradigms and research methods of at least one of the aforementioned disciplines or areas of study.

(2) In Educational Studies, interpretive, normative, and critical perspectives are developed through analysis of education as an academic field of study.

(3) In Educational Policy Studies, interpretive, normative, and critical perspectives are developed through the study of educational policy, policy making processes, and policy outcomes.

The complexities involved in each of these programs make it necessary that candidates be prepared with more than a single perspective. A minimum qualification would be concentrated preparation at a level appropriate to doctoral programs in at least one of the aforementioned disciplines or areas of study and general preparation in at least two others. To the extent possible, programs of study are expected to be individualized, thus taking into account the candidate's full background, including undergraduate and masters preparation and other professional experiences. To advance their interpretive, normative, and critical skills and understanding candidates are expected to: 1) produce demonstrable evidence of disciplined writing, 2) complete advanced study emphasizing appropriate research methodologies, and 3) participate in field experiences which strengthen their abilities to interpret and communicate the content and context of issues and themes central to their areas of concentration. Field experiences, including internships, are to be planned, supervised, and evaluated collaboratively by faculty in Foundations of Education, Educational Studies, or Educational Policy Studies and appropriate field personnel.

VII

Professional Development of Faculty in Foundations of Education, Educational Studies, and Educational Policy Studies

> *STANDARD 7:*
> **Faculty in Foundations of Education, Educational Studies, and Educational Policy Studies actively promote improvement of college or university teaching, engage in research and writing, participate regularly in the programs of appropriate professional and learned societies, and collaborate with educational practitioners and lay people on projects of mutual interest. Such activities promote the regular reassessment and growth of their interpretive, normative, and critical perspectives on education.**

Faculty members involved in teaching and research devoted to developing interpretive, normative, and critical perspectives on education participate in a broad range of professional and scholarly activities for the purpose of maintaining currency in their specializations. They play primary roles in promoting in-service and professional development opportunities for their colleagues. Parent institutions, professional associations, and learned societies assist these endeavors by promoting professional, scholarly, and community involvement among faculty. To keep current with movements in society at large and particular communities that impinge on their professional and scholarly commitments, faculty in Foundations of Education, Educational Studies, and Educational Policy Studies also collaborate with practitioners and lay persons in order to strengthen meaningful lines of communication and to support an integration of knowledge on fundamental issues and problems in education.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

From: Educational Theory 30 (Fall, 1980): 265-267

PHILOSOPHY OF EDUCATION SOCIETY

Standards for Academic and Professional Instruction in Philosophy of Education*

Established in 1941, the Philosophy of Education Society is the professional organization of scholars who through their academic training, research, publications and teaching, are concerned with instruction in philosophy of education as an integral part of programs preparing teachers and an increasing variety of other educational professionals. While the Philosophy of Education Society is primarily an organization of philosophers of education in the U.S.A., it is also an international society. Its membership includes many philosophers of education in Canada and, also, philosophers of education in England, many Erupean nations, India and other countries.

The Philosophy of Education Society seeks to improve the education of teachers and other persons having professional responsibilities of educational significance and import. The more *technical* components of the professional education sequence of teacher education programs are acquired through studies concerned with subject matter content for a teaching specialty, with curriculum design and methods of evaluation, and with mastery of methods of teaching and learning. Such studies are concerned largely with *how to do something*.

The more *liberal* components of the professional education sequence of teacher education are concerned with the principles, criteria and methods used in making practical judgments in education. These liberalizing professional components focus on clarifying, understanding, justifying and evaluating proposed ends and means in education. Many of the skills and concepts of this component are acquired through humanistic and behavioral studies (as described, for example, in the NCATE Standards). Behavioral studies promote understanding of the scientific aspects of practical judgment through the findings and methods of psychology, sociology, anthropology, economics, and political science. Humanistic studies relate educational concerns to their historical development and to the analytical, critical, interpretative and normative (ethical) perspectives and methods associated with the philosophical study of education.

Philosophical studies provide essential skills and concepts that cannot be treated quintessentially in behavioral, historical and pedagogical components of teacher education programs. Philosophy of education focuses on the principles, criteria and methods of achieving clarity and consistency in judgments, of detecting and evaluating basic assumptions, and of critically evaluating the soundness of arguments. In this critical dimension, philosophy of education is not merely an expression or development of personal opinions; it is an application of technical principles of philosophy for analyzing and evaluating meanings, premises, reasoning and arguments.

Philosophy of education is an activity that confronts the most basic and general conceptions used in (1) arguing about underlying causes of social and educational phenomena, as well as other questions dealing with the nature of reality, (2) analyzing contending purposes and standards for education, as well as other ethical questions, and (3) evaluating the basic principles and criteria we employ or assume when we make claims to the truthfulness of what we say. Philosophical studies may also have an integrative or synthesizing dimension, providing for the comprehensive collation and evaluation of theories, from a variety of disciplines, on general and basic questions regarding education as a fundamental cultural enterprise.

Whereas philosophy is a highly technical discipline, no one philosopher can be an expert in all its dimensions any more than can one historian be an expert in all history. However, the study of philosophy of education is not merely an opportunity to express or formulate a "personal philosophy." Philosophy of education is not a statement about current or proposed policies and practices, such as "all pupils should be treated with equal care and concern" or "we believe in the dignity of each individual." Philosophy of education includes critical scrutiny of such slogans for the purpose of formulating and justifying operationally relevant educational purposes.

Philosophy of education is not general philosophy. It is philosophic skills and concepts applied to educational concerns and issues. Practical judgments in education always involve combining philosophical premises with reasons or evidence about psychological, economic, administrative, sociological and other empirical matters. Thus, the requirements for philosophy of education are not adequately met by introductory or even advanced work in general philosophy.

In light of these considerations, the Philosophy of Education Society has formulated the following guidelines for evaluating teacher education programs in terms of (1) the qualifications of the personnel who teach courses in philosophy of education, (2) the philosophic dimension of their humanistic component, and (3) the content of curricula for advanced programs preparing teachers of philosophy of education.

1. *Guidelines for Qualifications of Teachers of Philosophy of Education*

This teacher should have an earned Doctor's degree with a major in philosophy of education from a department of philosophy, philosophy of education, or foundations of education having at least one faculty member who qualifies as Fellow in the Philosophy of Education Society.** In lieu of this degree, the instructor must be able to qualify as a Fellow in the Philosophy of Education Society through appropriate research and publications. The philosophy of education instructor should also demonstrate (1) a broad understanding of social-behavior sciences relevant to problems of learning, teaching, and human development, and (2) an understanding of the historical and present social contexts having significance for clarifying educational developments and issues in policies and practices of schooling and other educational settings.

2. *Guidelines for Evaluating the Philosophical Component of Humanistic Requirements for Initial Teachers Certification*

At least one-sixth of the professional preparation leading to initial teacher certification is to be devoted to humanistic studies. Where philosophic studies are used to meet the humanistic component the work will include a study of general philosophical skills and concepts and focus on the philosophical treatment of educational issues. It is not expected that the course content will necessarily lead to an endorsement of existing or proposed educational policies, practices or programs. They are to be examined in terms of axiological, epistemological, linguistic, logical and ontological considerations central to the philosophic enterprise. Within this framework, a variety of amphases and organizational patterns may be found, and no course is expected to cover all dimensions or applications of philosophic skills and subject matter.

The evaluation of the adequacy of the philosophical component of the humanistic requirements for initial teacher certification is to be made by specialists in ilosophy of education as indicated by the ability to meet the qualifications set r Fellows in the Philosophy of Education Society. The philosophical component s to be taught by individuals who meet the qualifications set for Fellows in the hilosophy of Education Society.

---

* These standards were adopted in 1980, and replace all previous guidelines.

** The following criteria are taken into account in determining whether or not an application as Fellow will be approved: (1) publications in the field of philosophy of education, (2) the teaching of collegiate courses in this field, (3) the completion of a doctoral degree and dissertation in this field.

3. *Guidelines for Evaluating the Humanistic Component of Non-Foundations Graduate Degrees and Programs*

At least one-sixth of master's and doctoral degree programs in education specializations, other than Philosophy of Education, should be devoted to humanistic studies promoting interpretative, normative, and critical perspectives in education. Where a course bears the title of Philosophy of Education it is to be evaluated and taught by faculty who meet the qualifications set for Fellow in the Philosophy of Education Society.

4. *Guidelines for Meeting Multicultural Education Requirements in Philosophy of Education Work*

Selected and appropriate elements related to multicultural education are to be included in philosophy of education studies in teacher education programs. Philosophical treatments may take varied forms such as consideration of problems of distributive justice and the application of analytical and evaluative skills and concepts to relevant material. Where a philosophic approach to multicultural education is employed it is to be conducted by faculty eligible for membership as a Fellow in the Philosophy of Education Society.

5. *Guidelines for Evaluating Doctoral Programs in Philosophy of Education*

Doctoral programs in philosophy of education are to include:

1) Substantial grounding in general philosophy through coursework and/or appropriate examinations. Provision is to be made for some degree of comprehensiveness so that the main divisions of philosophy (ontology, epistemology, axiology) are included.
2) Intensive study in philosophy of education.
3) A dissertation or equivalent work that focuses on philosophy of education and is supervised by a person eligible for membership as a Fellow in the Philosophy of Education Society.
4) Work in social-behavioral sciences relevant to problems in learning, human development and schooling.
5) Foundational studies that develop understandings of the historical and contemporary economic, social, and political contexts of education and schooling.

THE FOUNDATIONS OF EDUCATION IN TEACHER PREPARATION: A NATIONAL ASSESSMENT

CHRISTOPHER J. LUCAS AND IRVIN W. COCKRIEL*
University of Missouri—Columbia

INTRODUCTION

This study is an attempt to examine the status of the foundations of education component in teacher preparation programs throughout the United States. More specifically, the intent has been to identify and characterize patterns in undergraduate curricula within the areas of foundations of education, educational studies, and education policy studies; to highlight selected aspects of the institutional environment or "climate" of Schools, Colleges, and Departments of Education (SCDE's) as these are perceived to affect faculty in foundations of education; and, finally, to ascertain how such faculty in their respective academic units assess themselves in terms of academic and professional functions, instructional objectives, and institutional roles.

Heretofore, judgments on the state of the profession as a whole have been necessarily conjectural in character or based on a limited range of institutional experience. Virtually no relevant empirical research—with three exceptions—has been attempted previously on a national scale. Jones (1972), for example, compiled data on undergraduate and graduate "service" course offerings in foundations of education among certain selected institutions.[1] A more ambitious study by Wirsing (1976), conducted on behalf of the original Foundations of Education Curriculum Commission of the American Educational Studies Association, sought to construct in-depth profiles of graduate degree programs in foundations of education and related studies offered by U.S. and Canadian institutions.[2] Finally, Lucas (1979) surveyed the status of the foundations of education component in state regulations governing

---

*The authors express appreciation to all those persons without whose cooperation and assistance this research would have been impossible. The survey carried the official endorsement of the Executive Council of the American Educational Studies Association and was supported by grants from the Faculty Research Council of the Graduate School and the Faculty Research Fund of the College of Education, University of Missouri—Columbia. The authors assume sole responsibility for the accuracy of all findings and conclusions appearing in this report.

teacher preparation and initial certification, but did not attempt to document how institutional usage actually reflected specific requirements mandated.[3]

The present study, as a logical outgrowth of the 1979 survey of state certification regulations, was considerably more comprehensive in scope. A relatively large stratified sample of SCDE's was employed. The survey instrument utilized was designed to generate data on a broad range of topics never before examined systematically, including program requirements involving foundational coursework, assessment and evaluation practices, faculty attitudes and perceptions, and institutional compliance with the *Standards For Academic And Professional Instruction* endorsed by several foundations of education learned societies. A second survey of a sub-group of the population sample, using a different questionnaire, resulted in a still more detailed picture of instructional approaches commonly employed in certain SCDE's. Overall, it was hoped, this research would afford a more reliable basis for evaluating the place or position of the foundations of education in teacher preparation programs across the country.

SAMPLING PROCEDURE

Initially, a universe list of all SCDE's was generated by cross-referencing listings in *Barron's Profiles of American Colleges* (1978) with those in Harris, *Accredited Institutions of Postsecondary Education* (1978).[4] Whereas Clark and Guba (1977) identified a total of 1,380 SCDE's as of June, 1975 (subsequently reduced to 1,367 as of April, 1977, when more refined information became available), in the present study no more than 1,033 SCDE's could be located (as of March, 1980) which were engaged in pre-service undergraduate teacher education.[5] Excluded from consideration were non-accredited institutions, Canadian colleges and universities, and schools offering programs in health and physical education only.

An eight-page survey instrument was mailed to each of the 1,033 SCDE's comprising the total population, together with a request for information organized under four main headings or categories: (A) "The Institution," (B) "Institutional Climate," (C) "Professional/Academic Self Identity," and (D) "Curricula." Non-respondents received two letters requesting the return of questionnaires. A total of 496 (48% of the total) was eventually received. Prospects for any further improvement in the rate of return were considered unlikely in view of the complexity of the survey instrument used and the amount of time required for its completion.

As is common in all survey work, results are subjects to errors of response and non-reporting as well as to sampling variability. In order to minimize the former sources of error, responses on each questionnaire returned were checked manually for accuracy and internal consistency. Fifty-four questionnaires (11% of the total) were found to be unusable owing to inaccuracy or incompleteness.[6] From the remaining pool of 442 questionnaires, 380 were randomly selected for examination. Application of the appropriate statistical formulae indicated the latter total was sufficient for deriving a randomly-selected proportional stratified sample with a five percent coefficient of variance at the .05 confidence level. That is, the proposed sample size was found to result in no more than a plus or minus .10 sampling error with a confidence limit of 95%.[7]

Two basic stratification variates were employed: institutional status (i.e., public or private control) and institutional size (defined in terms of full-time-equivalent student enrollments—FTE's—in Education). Assignment of respondents within sub-categories from the larger pool of questionnaires was made using a computer-generated random number list. Altogether, 163 public and 217 private institutions were included, representing respectively 43% and 57% of the total sample. The aggregate undergraduate FTE enrollment of public institutions surveyed amounted to 132,600, or 73% of the total; the aggregate total for all private SCDE's was 47,807 FTE's or 27% of the combined FTE total of 180,407 students.[8]

"Small" institutions were defined as those with enrollment FTE's in Education of less than 500 students; "medium-sized" SCDE's were defined as those having enrollments of between 501 and 1,499 student FTE's; and "large" institutions were designated as those with FTE enrollments in Education in excess of 1,500. The sample breakdown by size and institutional status is summarized in Table 1.

TABLE 1. SAMPLE POPULATION BY INSTITUTIONAL STATUS AND SIZE

STATUS	SMALL		MEDIUM		LARGE	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
Public	57	15	51	13	55	14
Private	187	49	22	6	8	2
Totals	244	64	73	19	63	17

An independent check of the sample was made to ascertain the distribution of SCDE's by geographical areas. It was determined that all 50 states were represented and, purely by coincidence, in approximate proportion to the respective total numbers of institutions within seven arbitrarily-defined geographical regions of the country.[9]

CHARACTERISTICS OF THE SAMPLE POPULATION: A QUANTITATIVE SUMMARY

Institutions surveyed varied greatly in terms of total student enrollments, ranging from a low of 549 to a high of 49,680. The mean enrollment of all students, both undergraduate and graduate, in all fields among public colleges and universities was 8,545; among private institutions the figure was 1,913, with a combined average of 4,758. The median FTE enrollment for public institutions was 6,000; for private schools it was 1,100 students; and the combined median point was calculated at 1,912. The hypothetical "average" public SCDE reported 813 FTE undergraduates enrolled in Education; the mean total among private institutions was much lower (220), and the combined average for both public and private SCDE's was 475 undergraduates majoring in Education. With graduate FTE's added in, public SCDE's reported an average FTE enrollment of 1,144; for private FTE's the total was 281, resulting in a mean combined total of 651 students. Among public institutions, student FTE's ranged upward to 5,531, whereas a total of 4,000 students was the highest number reported by a private university.

Respondents were asked to identify by its official designation the type of administrative unit within each institution most directly involved in teacher education. Approximately 34% cited a "department," while 26% indicated a "division." Over one in five (21%), identified a "school" and 16% a "college." Three percent of all respondents failed to answer the inquiry. Not surprisingly, 28% of all private institutions, which tended to be smaller than their public counterparts, cited "departments," while 27% of all public institutions indicated a school or college of Education.

No consistent pattern was discernible in the nomenclature used by sample SCDE's for identifying the administrative sub-unit within a department, division, school, or college housing foundations of education courses and faculty. Few completely independent departments were mentioned by title. More commonly, even among the largest SCDE's, "foundations of education" or its approximate equivalent was conjoined with one or more other academic and professional areas, (e.g., Curriculum and Instruction, Administration, Secondary Education, Educational Psychology, Counseling, Research and Statistics, etc.). Again, no single configuration appeared to predominate: "foundations" as a rubric was apt to be linked with any other designation (e.g., "Curriculum and Foundations of Education" or "Education Administration, Supervision, and Foundations," etc.). The term "foundations" still finds widespread usage, occuring almost twice as frequently as "educational studies" or "education policy studies."

The number of full-time-equivalent faculty teaching courses in foundations of education also varied greatly in the sample population, ranging from less than a single FTE person to 26 faculty FTE's. The mean figure reported for public institutions was five (median, three); for private SCDE's the figure was two, yielding a combined average of three persons. The ratio of faculty FTE's in foundations to total faculty FTE's holding appointments in Education was one to nine among public SCDE's and one to five for private SCDE's, or a combined average ratio of one to seven. Total faculty sizes in Education averaged 40 FTE's among public institutions, 10 among private schools and colleges, and 23 for both combined. The upper range among the former was 222, among the latter the figure reached 160.

Faculty size was also analyzed in relation to student FTE enrollment in Education both for all regular faculty in Education and, more specifically, for faculty in foundations relative to student enrollments. On the average, for public and private institutions combined, the ratio of faculty FTE's in Education to student FTE's in Education was 1 to 21 at the undergraduate level, 1 to 9 at the graduate level, and for both undergraduate and graduate students in public and private SCDE's, 1 to 29. The mean ratio of faculty teaching courses in foundations to undergraduate FTE's in Education was found to be 1 to 156; for faculty relative to Education graduate students the average was 1 to 68; and the ratio for all SCDE's, undergraduates and graduates together, amounted to 1 to 214.

Of particular interest are data pertaining to the percentage of faculty members teaching courses in foundations of education who had earned their highest degrees in foundations of education. Significantly, it was common to find that no members of a given faculty had been trained in history and philosophy of education, comparative education, sociology of education, educational policy studies, and so on, even though such persons were offering instruction in those areas. In public institutions, only 40% of those teaching foundations courses had received their highest degree in the field of instruction. For private institutions the percentage fell even lower (to 21%), making for a combined average of 29%. Hence, in a "typical" or "average" SCDE, chances would be only about one out of three that a faculty member teaching a course in foundations of education actually majored in the field at the graduate level.

Finally, it was determined that 56% of all SCDE's surveyed offered programs accredited by the National Council For The Accreditation of Teacher Education (NCATE), and fully 73% were affiliated members of the American Association of Colleges of Teacher Education (AACTE). Three percent failed to indicate accreditation status, and four percent did not respond to the question asking whether the respondent's institution was an AACTE member. A disproportionate number of smaller private colleges indicated non-affiliation with the AACTE; likewise, among the 41% of all SCDE's indicating lack of NCATE program accreditation, smaller private institutions accounted for almost all respondents.

THE FOUNDATIONAL COURSEWORK COMPONENT IN TEACHER EDUCATION PROGRAMS

Total semester-hour credits required for completion of a baccalaureate degree in Education reported by the 380 institutions surveyed ranged from 120 to 139, averaging 124 hours. No significant differences were found between public and private schools, nor did the mean total reported vary among small, medium, and large institutions. In the present study the reported mean total semester hours of coursework required for elementary majors from all institutions combined was 31; for secondary education majors the comparable total averaged 24 hours, exclusive of clinical experiences.[19] As percentages of the total hours required for completion of the baccalaureate degree, the figures were 25 percent and 20 percent respectively. This tends to confirm the findings of Lewin et al. (1977) and Haberman and Stinnett (1975) who found that elementary education majors on the average were required to complete 37.5 semester hours in professional studies and secondary education majors 25.4 semester hours (exclusive of field experiences).

Required coursework in foundations of education typically accounts for an even smaller part of the total credit hours needed to complete a baccalaureate degree in Education. The mean total of semester-credit hours in foundational courses out of the average 124-hour total was 4.95 for public institutions and 4.64 for private SCDE's, with a combined average of 4.77 hours. These figures suggest a typical pattern of something less than two 3-hour semester-credit courses or their quarter-hour equivalent. Moreover, respondents may have construed the rubric "foundations" rather broadly in terms of types of coursework included. Nor do the mean totals translate into especially impressive percentages of the average number of required hours in professional education as a whole. Table 2 summarizes the principal findings.

TABLE 2. FOUNDATIONS OF EDUCATION COURSEWORK AS MEAN PERCENTAGES OF TOTAL DEGREE PROGRAM HOURS AND PROFESSIONAL EDUCATION HOURS

FOUNDATIONS COURSEWORK	% PUBLIC SCDE's	% PRIVATE SCDE's	% COMBINED SCDE's
Foundations of Education Hours as Percentage of Total Degree Hours	3.9	3.7	3.8
Foundations of Education Hours as a Percentage Required Elementary Education Coursework	15.5	15.6	15.5
Foundations of Education Hours as a Percentage of Required Secondary Education Coursework	19.1	20.1	19.6

These figures are apt to be misleading without further interpretation. The mean percentage total for secondary education majors for public and private SCDE's combined, for example, appears at 19.6% or just under one-fifth of all credit-hours in professional education. However, for purposes of illustration, if it is assumed that the average total of 25.4 hours reflects just over eight 3-hour courses, a single 3-hour course in foundations would suffice to reflect the percentage figure cited. Again, the average of 15.5 percent of all professional education coursework represented by required hours in foundations for elementary majors (public and private SCDE's combined) translates as less than two 3-hour courses. Mean totals also serve to conceal variability in the distribution of figures reported for minimum required hours of coursework in foundations of education. Thus, a very small number of large (typically public) SCDE's indicating foundations requirements ranging as high as 12 to 15 hours served to inflate the mean total for all SCDE's in the aggregate. Among smaller SCDE's in particular, reports of no more than two or three required hours of foundational coursework were most common.

Fully 75% of all public SCDE's and 82% of their private counterparts indicated that students were required to complete one or more foundations of education courses in common. Among the former (public) 75%, 36% permitted students to select from four different course alternatives to satisfy a common requirement; 27% allowed a choice from three courses; 18% offered students a choice from among five or more alternatives; and 10% required a selection between two courses. The remaining nine percent failed to indicate what choices, if any, were made available. For the 82% of the private SCDE's permitting students to select from different courses in order to satisfy a foundations of education requirement, the overwhelming majority (88%) offered only two alternatives, while 4% allowed students a choice among three or more courses. Approximately eight percent did not indicate what pattern prevailed.

INSTITUTIONAL COMPLIANCE WITH STANDARDS FOR ACADEMIC AND PROFESSIONAL INSTRUCTION

Standard #1, "Interpretive, Normative, and Critical Studies Component of Initial Teacher Certification," of the *Standards for Academic and Professional Instruction* (endorsed by the American Educational Studies Association and several other learned and professional societies) stipulates that "at least one-sixth of the professional preparation leading to initial teacher certification is to be devoted to humanistic and social foundational studies. . . ."[11] This standard was taken to require a minimum of 16.6% of all coursework in professional education, including clinical and field experiences, in foundations of education. In attempting to determine the extent of institutional compliance with the standard, a less stringent criterion was adopted whereby credits generated through classroom aiding and observation or student teaching were *excluded* from consideration. That is, if an institution's foundational component accounted for at least 16.6% or one-sixth of all required *academically*-based education coursework, its program was regarded as in compliance.

Interestingly, fully 53% of all public and private SCDE's in the sample claimed to be unaware of the standard. About 28% reported substantial" compliance, and 28% conceded non-compliance but indicated a hope or expectation of compliance within the near future. Less than three percent reported disagreement with the standard; nine percent of all respondents failed to respond to the question. Among public institutions of all sizes, 43% professed ignorance of the standard's existence, and an equal percentage (43%) claimed to be in compliance or indicated an expectation of being so shortly. Among private SCDE's of all sizes, 60% were unaware of the standard, and almost a quarter (24%) reported compliance. Over 52% of all small private institutions fell into the former category.

Of the SCDE's reporting compliance with Standard I, 54 were public and 51 were private. A cross-check was made by comparing the number of required hours in foundations of education at these 105 institutions with their respective hour totals for all required coursework in professional education. The results were then expressed as mean percentages. The mean percentage for all public and private SCDE's indicating compliance was 17.2% for elementary majors and 22.1% for majors in secondary education. In the public SCDE's sampled, foundational coursework accounted for an average of 18.6% of all professional education coursework required of elementary education majors, and 23.6% of that required for secondary education majors. But while required coursework in the foundations of education represented 20.4% on the average of total professional coursework for majors in secondary education at private institutions (all sizes combined), the former totaled only 15.6% of the latter as an average for majors in elementary education at private SCDE's, thereby indicating non-conformity with the minimal criterion stipulated by the standard. A total of 38 institutions (public and private) lacked the requisite percentage figure.

Also included within the text of the same standard is a requirement that "the foundational component of the professional preparation program is to be developed and conducted or supervised by persons" who hold doctoral degrees in foundations of education, educational studies or educational policy studies, and, further, that such persons be graduates of doctoral programs which meet certain minimal requirements outlined in Standard #VI, "Preparation of Faculty in Foundations of Education, Educational Studies, and Educational Policy Studies."[13]

While mean percentages offer only a gross indicator of institutional compliance, the average totals cited earlier may be suggestive. In requesting data on the percentage of regular faculty members presently teaching courses in foundations whose highest earned degrees were in foundations of education, responses ranged from 0 to 100%. Thus, it is conceivable that in a large school with upwards of 12 or more faculty in foundations, all might hold the appropriate degrees, and hence a total of 100% would be cited. Likewise, in a smaller institution with only two foundational faculty persons, neither holding the requisite degree, the reported percentage would be 0.

For these and other reasons, aggregate means afford only limited insight into actual circumstances prevailing on a national scale. Nonetheless, it is instructive to note that the percentage of persons teaching foundations of education courses in public institutions who were non-holders of related degrees averaged fully 60% while the mean percentage among private SCDE's was 79%. The combined average was 71%. Lacking in the data is any indication as to whether or not holders of appropriate degrees in foundations graduated from programs which in fact conform to the stipulations of Standard #VI. Moreover, no effort was made to determine what percentage of faculty engaged in teaching foundational courses holds doctoral degrees of any type whatsoever.

Included within the sample population were 35 institutions (9.2%) offering Ed.D. and/or Ph.D. programs in foundations of education. All but two of these were large public institutions.[11] By comparing their reported numbers of faculty FTE's teaching in foundations, it became possible to determine whether their programs were likely to conform to a requirement in Standard #VI that the minimum number of academic staff involved directly in offering a doctoral degree program should be five FTE's. Among doctoral-degree granting institutions, this total ranged from a low of 1 to a reported high of 26 FTE's. The average number of foundations faculty was nine. Eight SCDE's (23%) indicated fewer than five faculty FTE's.

INSTITUTIONAL ENVIRONMENT

Faculty in foundations of education were asked to assess the general "climate" or environment within their respective institutions as it affects their own professional or academic well-being. Characterizing their relations with colleagues teaching other courses in professional education, a majority of respondents—62%—indicated "collegiality, respect, professional regard, reciprocity, and close working relations." The percentage among private SCDE's was even higher: 73%. An additional 21% of respondents from public and private institutions selected the terms "acceptance, toleration, and cooperation" to describe their working relations with colleagues in other specialties within professional Education. Only five percent chose such descripters as "indifference," "suspicion and distrust," "hostility," or "rivalry and friction."

Generally, a strong positive correlation was found between the size of an SCDE and the frequency with which internal faculty relations were charactered in positive terms, suggesting perhaps that inter-departmental relationships among faculty are much more a function of numbers of persons involved than any specific disciplinary affiliations or academic specialties. Thus, for example, 63% of all respondents from small private colleges chose "collegiality" to describe the associations of faculty members teaching foundations courses with their peers in other areas. The equivalent figure for small public SCDE's was 48%. On the other hand, the mean percentage of those from large public and private SCDE's combined indicating positive or cordial relations was no higher than 11%.

Slightly different patterns were found in analyzing responses to a request for a characterization by faculty in foundations of the attitudes of colleagues in other areas toward the organization, content, and instruction of foundations of education *courses*. Over half—55%—of the responses from public and private SCDE's combined indicated that faculty peers were perceived to regard such courses as "an essential or integral component" within the institution's teacher preparation programs. An additional 24% claimed foundations courses were considered "important and defensible" elements within programs, and still another 11% characterized the attitudes of colleagues in other areas toward such courses as "accepted but not necessarily valued or understood." Fewer than three percent of those responding claimed that faculty colleagues in other fields within professional education looked upon foundations courses as being of "limited or peripheral importance" or that peers evidenced doubt as to their real functional value in pre-service teacher education. Foundational faculty perceptions of colleagues' attitudes did not correlate highly with either institutional size or status. Although respondents from public institutions tended to be more positive in their assessments than did their counterparts in private SCDE's, the difference between the two sub-groups in the sample was judged to be insignificant. Likewise, no substantial correlations were found between the extent or frequency with which positive peer attitudes were cited and the size of the reporting SCDE.

On the whole, foundations faculty surveyed indicated strong support for their areas from administrative superordinates (e.g., deans). Thus, when asked to characterize the attitude of the ranking administrative officer toward the department or area in which foundations of education courses are taught, *as compared with* other departments, units, or areas, 87% of the respondents from public and private SCDE's combined chose such descripters as "vigorous support, enthusiastic acclaim, strong commitment" (46%) or "qualified acceptance, moderate support and commitment" (41%). No significant differences were found among small, medium, and large institutions, or between public and private SCDE's. Hence, it was concluded that faculty teaching foundations of education courses as a rule do not feel disadvantaged or neglected in terms of administrative support vis-à-vis other academic units. No more than 10% of all respondents, for example, elected such characterizations as "indifference," "minimal support," or "distrust, suspicion, lack of support" for describing the attitudes of administrative personnel.

Respondents were asked to rank what they and colleagues teaching foundations courses considered as their greatest collective strengths. Among faculty in public SCDE's, the ranking in order of descending frequency and the respective percentages were as follows: "scholarly expertise" was most often cited at the top of the list (by 23% of those answering the question); followed by "pedagogical expertise" as the second greatest strength (28%); "service to the department, area, school, college, or institution as a whole (22%); and "service to the profession at the local, state, regional, and national levels" was ranked last (43%). Faculty self-assessments from private SCDE's produced a different rank ordering: 19% considered "the intrinsic nature (importance, relevance)" of the content of instruction as most important; 36% cited "scholarly expertise" as next in importance; "pedagogical competence" was listed next by 21%; service within the institution followed, as indicated by 24%; and service to the profession at large was ranked last by 39% of the respondents.

No systematic attempt was made to examine differences in the rankings supplied by SCDE's according to size. A cursory examination of the data, however, suggested that "scholarly expertise" and the intrinsic importance of content material tended to be cited most often as greatest strengths by larger institutions. Smaller SCDE's appeared most frequently to emphasize pedagogical excellence and service within the institution. Large and small SCDE's alike cited their service role at local, state, regional, and national levels at least important.

Only limited success was achieved in attempting to identify what foundational faculty saw as "problems or weaknesses" which were considered to be "unique to, particularly distinctive of, or appear to impact disproportionately upon faculty teaching courses in foundations of education, as compared with faculty in other areas of professional education." Almost one-third of all respondents failed to address the question, thereby rendering any detailed analysis of the data somewhat suspect. Combining all public and private SCDE's, regardless of size, generated the following rank order: "declining student enrollments" was cited by 25% of those who answered, followed by "lack of opportunities for in-service faculty growth and development" (13%), "institutional, societal or cultural indifference to (or antipathy toward) what we teach (e.g., course content)" (11%), "inadequate administrative support, resources, or funding relative to institutionally-defined responsibilities" (10%), "lack of faculty support and understanding" (9%), and "inadequately prepared faculty" (6%). Another 19% of all respondents cited as problems or weaknesses "insufficient opportunities for 'input' into the institution's teacher preparation programs," pedagogical mediocrity or lack of excellence in classroom instruction, inadequate teaching resources, internecine rivalry among faculty members, and a host of other factors.

One question sought to discover how faculty FTE's teaching courses in foundations of education had changed over the past three to five years. About 59% of the public SCDE's reported no increase or decrease; 79% of the private institutions in the sample answered likewise. Almost a third (31%) of the public SCDE's reported a net loss of one or more FTE's, but only 11% of the private schools did so. Eight percent of the former and seven percent of the latter indicated a net increase of one or more faculty FTE's in foundations of education. The combined mean percentages were: "unchanged" (71%), "net increase" (8%), and "net decrease" (19%).

Closely related was a question calling for future projections over the next three to five years in the number of faculty FTE's teaching courses in foundations of education. Nine percent of all institutions responding expected a net increase of one or more persons. No expected change was anticipated by 71%, and 17% considered a net loss of faculty as "possible" or "highly probable." Expected losses were cited most frequently by large public SCDE's and least frequently by medium-sized and small institutions, both public and private.

When asked to project into the immediate future what would most likely happen to the number of mandated credit hours in foundations of education at the undergraduate level, 84% of all respondents guessed the hour total would remain the same; 9% expected it to increase, and 5% looked for a probable decrease. Two percent did not respond. No significant patterns were discernible in drawing comparisons between public and private SCDE's, nor were there major differences apparent in comparing institutions by size of enrollments.

Responsive to demographic trends affecting student enrollments in preservice undergraduate teacher education, many SCDE's reportedly have broadened their programs to provide for the professional preparation of educators planning to work in non-school settings. Others report that they are planning to do so shortly or are actively considering the development of new programs for agency counselors and others pursuing "human service" careers. Hence it is significant that 85% of all those surveyed reported that the major role of the foundations of education within their SCDE's at present is exclusively one of service to the institution's teacher education program. Less than seven percent claimed their role was "only partially related" to service within a teacher preparation program; and a still smaller number—two percent—reported that the role of foundations of education was independent of, or "largely unrelated" to, such a service function. Six percent supplied no answer or indicated no undergraduate-level instruction in foundations of education was offered. Clearly, the institutional base for foundations of education instruction at present and for the foreseeable future rests with teacher preparation.

This conclusion is reinforced by responses to a question intended to fix whatever consensus of opinion might exist among faculty teaching courses in foundations of education as to their future role within the institution. Seven percent failed to respond. But 53% of the respondents from public SCDE's and 66% from private SCDE's agreed that "our future is tied primarily or exclusively to that of academically-based teacher education." The combined mean percentage was 61%. Approximately 36% of the public institutions surveyed and 24% of their private equivalents reported: "We are expanding our emphasis (or plan to do so shortly) to include, besides teaching, related careers in the helping professions and human services areas." The mean percentage for public and private SCDE's together was 29%. On the average, only four percent of public institutions and three percent of the private schools indicated an emphasis upon the study of education *policy* not tied programmatically to teacher education.

INSTRUCTION AND CURRICULA

Faculty teaching courses in foundations of education are apt to hold disparate views on the most appropriate ways of organizing undergraduate instruction. They likewise differ as to fundamental objectives. Respondents were asked to select from among four generically different ways of organizing undergraduate courses, indicating which alternative most nearly reflected any discernible consensus of opinion among their colleagues. The four possibilities presented were abstracted from the Preamble to the *Standards For Academic And Professional Instruction*. The full text of the four statements as it appeared on the survey instrument follows:

> Foundations of education courses should be organized around educational *concepts and/or issues* which furnish the conceptual apparatus for the theory and practice of education.
>
> Foundations of education courses should reflect interdisciplinary and generalist concerns which *supercede or transcend specific discipline-based approaches* to the subject matter.
>
> Foundations of education courses should be organized in terms of the conceptual apparatus and methodologics characteristic of established academic *disciplines* (e.g., history, philosophy, sociology, etc.).
>
> Foundations of education courses should be structured such that they reflect most directly the concepts, problems and concerns of teacher-educators working in such fields as curriculum and instruction, counseling and guidance, administration, etc.

The "concepts and issues" option was selected by 39% of those from public SCDE's and 45% from private SCDE's. The combined mean percentage was 43%. Next in frequency of citation was the "interdisciplinary and generalist" approach, as favored by 21% and 23%, respectively, of public and private institutions. Grouped together, the aggregate mean frequency was 22%. Fifteen percent of both private and public SCDE's chose the discipline-based approach. A combined average of 14% (public: 18%, private: 11%) preferred the fourth alternative cited above.

These figures need to be interpreted with some care. Each alternative is open to variant interpretations. Further, the question as it was posed allowed no specification of the types of courses involved. Thus, for example, a general introductory survey course entitled "Introduction to Education" or "Social Foundations of Education" might very well lend itself to a different organizational pattern than a course entitled "School and Society" or perhaps "Current Issues And Trends In Contemporary Education." Minimally, however, it appears that faculty surveyed tend most frequently to structure instruction around concepts or issues in education.

Respondents were also asked to generalize about what they believed a majority of persons teaching foundations of education within their individual SCDE's might consider the most appropriate instructional *outcomes* for undergraduate courses in foundations of education. Again, the alternative responses supplied were nonspecific in character, yet were sufficiently different from one another to permit some recognizable distinctions: 44% of the persons in public SCDE's and 42% of those from private institutions chose as the most appropriate outcome "broad theoretical understanding, contextual knowledge, scholarly insight"; 38% of the public and private SCDE's combined selected "principles (interpretive, normative, critical) directive of policy and practice"; finally, "specific pedagogical expertise, rules, norms, applicative knowledge and skills" was reported by 15% of those from public schools and 11% from private colleges or departments. The combined mean percentage was 13%.

Possible differences among large, medium, and small-sized institutions were not systematically investigated. An informal "spot-check" suggested the overall pattern did not vary greatly as a function of size, except that larger institutions tended to report "broad theoretical understanding" more often, while smaller SCDE's were inclined to favor "specific pedagogical expertise" as the most appropriate instruction outcome.

Closely related was a question designed to identify the "focus" or "context" of foundations of education courses offered. The concern was two-fold: the process or character of instruction, and the rationale for courses in terms of what they are intended to achieve. Respondents were offered three basic alternatives and requested to select whichever reflected most closely the majority viewpoint among foundations faculty. The three options were listed as follows:

> disinterested scholarship, academic neutrality and impartiality, objectivity, pure *description* of educational phenomena
>
> 'consciousness-raising,' general criticism, heightened socio-economic and political awareness, critical *analysis* of educational phenomena
>
> *didactics*, partisanship, reform advocacy (i.e., teaching 'against' the profession and established usage)

Eighty-two percent of the responses from all SCDE's identified "analysis" as the predominant focus or purpose of foundational coursework nearly 10% chose the purely "descriptive" function; and less than 1% selected "didactics" to characterize courses. Eight percent failed to respond to the question. Answers varied only slightly between public and private schools; no significant differences emerged as a function of institutional size.

One of the most complex questions posed in the present survey—and the most difficult to interpret or evaluate—dealt with the attitudes of undergraduate students toward courses in foundations of education, as these attitudes are perceived by faculty. The question was necessarily subjective in character, as were the responses to it, but the hope was that faculty might have a "feel" for how students regard the foundational component of the pre-service preparation program, both prior to and upon completion of one or more courses. How trustworthy any generalizations in these respects are remains open to question, but a remarkably uniform pattern of responses emerged, one exhibiting very little variability among institutions arranged by size or status. Of all respondents, 44% judged student attitudes toward courses prior to instruction to be one of "qualified acceptance." A quarter—24%—characterized student opinion as one of "indifference," and 14% believed students' feelings about foundations of education courses revealed "enthusiasm" and "support." Seven percent indicated it was "impossible to judge" and five percent gave no answer. Only four percent claimed students evidenced a "lack of interest" and fewer still, one percent, concluded students' attitudes could be characterized by "antipathy" or active "hostility."

The same unanimity of opinion persisted among respondents when asked to characterize student attitudes toward foundations of education courses following their completion. Over half (52%) of those from public and private SCDE's combined, indicated a student response of "qualified acceptance." Comparing within this category prior to enrollment and upon completion of one or more courses, the increase was 8%. Thirty-one percent of all those responding reported a student reaction of "enthusiasm" and "support" after taking the course—an increase of 17%. In other words, students were felt to be more positive in their reactions once they had taken work in the area.

Somewhat optimistically, the corresponding percentage decreases by categories for describing post-instructional attitudes showed a 20% average drop (from 24% to 4%) among respondents characterizing student opinion as one of "indifference," a 3% decrease within the category of "lack of interest" and little or no change in the mean percentage who felt students' feelings of "antipathy" or "hostility" remained unaltered. While reported shifts may be self-serving, the overall pattern suggests a faculty presumption that undergraduate students' attitudes change for the better (i.e., they become more positive or favorable) once they have had an opportunity to complete a foundations course.

A follow-up question asked whether assessments of student attitudes toward courses had any empirical validity, i.e., were based on concrete data derived from course evaluations. Of all respondents, 72% from public SCDE's and 78% from private institutions answered affirmatively. The combined mean percentage was 76%. Six percent of all respondents did not reply. Eighteen percent indicated they had no specific information on which to base conclusions.

A FURTHER INVESTIGATION

Identifying "foundations of education" courses with any high degree of exactitude is notoriously difficult. For purposes of the initial survey, respondents were advised that the operational definition employed in the present study was derived from the characterization supplied in the Preamble to *Standards For Academic And Professional Instruction In Foundations Of Education, Educational Studies And Educational Policy Studies* alluded to previously. The following text was reproduced in its entirety on the original questionnaire:

> The Foundations of Education refers to a broadly-conceived field of study that derives its character and fundamental theories from a number of academic disciplines, combinations of disciplines, and area studies: history, philosophy, sociology, anthropology, religion, political science, economics, psychology, comparative and international education, educational studies, and educational policy studies.
> [Further], . . . An overarching and profoundly important academic and professional purpose unifies persons who identify with . . . Foundations of Education, namely, *the development of interpretive, normative and critical perspectives on education, including non-schooling enterprises.*

A preliminary attempt at uncovering what specific kinds of foundational courses are offered at the undergraduate level (whether required or elective) by SCDE's throughout the country involved the enumeration of 24 possibilities, from which respondents were asked to choose in identifying courses offered at least once a year. The list was generated *a priori*, though validated informally by consulting course titles appearing in the catalogues of 24 teacher education institutions selected at random. Significantly, fewer than two percent of all respondents found it necessary to check the option "others," suggesting the list of courses supplied was reasonably comprehensive.

Fourteen out of the 24 possibilities were cited by 10% or more of those responding. Table 3 summarizes the data for titles most frequently offered and indicates the percentages for public and private SCDE's as well as the *total* percentages for both combined:

TABLE 3. UNDERGRADUATE FOUNDATIONS OF EDUCATION COURSES MOST FREQUENTLY OFFERED

COURSE DESCRIPTER	RANK ORDER	% OF PUBLIC SCDE's	% OF PRIVATE SCDE's	% OF COMBINED SCDE's
Introduction to Education	1	65	55	60
Philosophy of Education	2	74	45	58
History of American Education	3	49	34	40
Curriculum Theory	4	50	32	39
(Humanistic) Psychology of Education	5	42	30	35
Issues And Trends In Education	6	46	24	34
School Law	7	48	15	29
Social Foundations of Education	8	36	20	28
Multi-cultural Education	9	36	19	27
School Organization, Management	10	39	14	25
Comparative Education	11	37	10	22
Human Relations in Education	11	30	16	22
Sociology of Education	12	31	12	19
History of Educational Thought	13	22	10	15

Other courses reported by fewer than 10 percent of all SCDE's surveyed included: Contemporary Educational Theory, Politics and Education, Religion and Education, Educational Economics, Aesthetics and Education, Policy Analysis In Education, Educational Anthropology, World History of Education, Special Topics, and Contemporary Criticism in Education.

A simple frequency count of different types of foundations of education courses offered at the undergraduate level among a select sample of SCDE's falls short of revealing much about the specific content of those courses (above and beyond the identifying rubric, e.g., Sociology of Education or Comparative Education, etc.). Nor does the data indicate in any detail how such courses are organized. For answers to these questions, a second survey was conducted.

A separate, shorter questionnaire was sent to 99 large public and private SCDE's known to offer graduate-degree programs in foundations of education, educational studies, and educational policy studies. The original list was compiled on the basis of information generated in Wirsing's 1976 study and/or from other sources. Prospective respondents were requested to complete a check list by means of which types of *undergraduate* foundational courses offered could be summarized as well as how they are taught. The assumption behind the selection of graduate-degree-granting institutions for the second survey was that these SCDE's would be most likely to offer the greatest range and variety of undergraduate foundations courses. With the exception of institutions involved exclusively in graduate-level instruction in the field, this assumption proved well-founded.

The taxonomy or classification system employed was developed informally and without the benefit of data generated from the first survey. (In fact, the two surveys were conducted simultaneously.) The criterion of validity stipulated was that fewer than 10% of the respondents would find it necessary to check the category of "other" in identifying which of several common approaches to the content and instruction of five different courses found application at their respective universities. In a preliminary field test of the survey instrument involving 13 institutions selected at random from the total of 99, the criterion was met, i.e., fewer than 10% checked "other" from the list of alternative course formats.[14]

Of 99 questionnaires sent, 69 were returned, representing a return rate of 69.7%. Four of these could not be used since the institutions in question reported offering no undergraduate-level courses in foundations of education. Sixty out of the remaining 65 SCDE's (92%) indicated they offered one or more courses in "Social Foundations of Education/Introduction to Teaching." Forty-three (66%) offered one or more pre-service courses in "Philosophy of Education." Twenty-two, or 42% of the total, indicated one or more courses in "History of Education," and 20 (31%) reported courses in "Comparative/International Education." Thirty-nine out of the 65 responding SCDE's (60%) also recorded responses under a "Miscellaneous" category encompassing 10 additional types of courses.

Tables 4 through 9 summarize by percentages the overall patterns of responses for each of five course categories, plus the respective percentages of respondents who checked courses under a sixth heading of "Miscellaneous."

TABLE 4. INSTRUCTIONAL APPROACHES BY PERCENTAGES TO THE TEACHING OF COURSES IN SOCIAL FOUNDATIONS OF EDUCATION/INTRODUCTION TO TEACHING

ORGANIZATION OF CONTENT/INSTRUCTIONAL APPROACH	% WITHIN CATEGORY	% OF TOTAL RESPONDENTS
School and society, issues and trends (problems, movements, controversies, etc.) in education.	24	38
Introduction to education as a practical endeavor and as a field of study (descriptive overview), socialization and schooling, administration and governance, local-state-federal relations, legal issues and school law, supreme court decisions affecting schooling, teaching as a career and a profession, classroom discipline, teacher ethics, societal determinants of curricula, etc.	21	31
"Other"	17	14
Eclectic, inter-disciplinary approach to the study of education, e.g., segments organized *by disciplines:* history, philosophy, sociology, psychology, issues and trends, etc.	16	35
Social-intellectual criticism: societal determinants of education, school and the social/economic/political order, ideological movements, alternative governance models in schooling, etc.	8	22
Aims and objectives, methodologies, organization of schooling, trends and movements, issues and controversies, etc.	8	17
Sociological overview; social class stratification, socialization, political culture, schooling and socio-economic equality/mobility, bureaucratization, governance, etc.	6	15

TABLE 5. INSTRUCTION APPROACHES BY PERCENTAGES TO THE TEACHING OF COURSES IN PHILOSOPHY OF EDUCATION

ORGANIZATION OF CONTENT/INSTRUCTIONAL APPROACH	% WITHIN CATEGORY	% OF TOTAL RESPONDENTS
Philosophic systems or schools of thought in their educational bearings (e.g., Realism, Idealism, Pragmatism, Existentialism, etc.)	21	26
"Other"	13	9
Philosophers of education, classical and modern, and their doctrines	11	12
Philosophic categories of inquiry (e.g., metaphysics, epistemology, ethics, etc.) applied to educational issues, concepts, problems	9	14
Social, political philosophy in relation to contemporary social, economic, and political issues in education	9	14
Existentialist, phenomenological criticism and education	9	6
School and society, ideological movements in education	8	12
Selected contemporary education theorists (e.g., Piaget, Kohlberg, Bruner, R.S. Peters, etc.) and their writings	5	9
Analysis of concepts, arguments, etc. in educational discourse; theory construction in education, ordinary language analysis; philosophy as logical/conceptual inquiry	5	8
Moral philosophy, ethics in education, normative discourse	3	6
Neo-Marxist interpretation, criticism of educational policy/practice	2	6
Critical theory, sociology of knowledge in relation to education	2	3
Policy analysis and education	2	3
Literary, aesthetic criticism, analysis and education	1	2

TABLE 6. INSTRUCTION APPROACHES BY PERCENTAGES TO THE TEACHING OF COURSES IN SOCIOLOGY OF EDUCATION

ORGANIZATION OF CONTENT/INSTRUCTIONAL APPROACH	% WITHIN CATEGORY	% OF TOTAL RESPONDENTS
Concept or *issue*-oriented analysis of American education (e.g., socialization, social stratification by class, race, sex, religion, etc.)	46	29
Descriptive overview of American school system, organization and administration, learner characteristics, access and attrition, sociological determinants of curricula, etc.	34	18
Sociological/*philosophic analysis, criticism,* utilizing theoretical constructs derived from prominent writers, e.g., Durkheim, Halbermas, etc.)	10	9
"Other"	7	8
In-depth *case studies* of education phenomena in their sociological bearings	4	3

TABLE 7. INSTRUCTION APPROACHES BY PERCENTAGES TO THE TEACHING OF COURSES IN HISTORY OF EDUCATION

ORGANIZATION OF CONTENT/INSTRUCTIONAL APPROACH	% WITHIN CATEGORY	% OF TOTAL RESPONDENTS
Survey of education from the American colonial period to modern times	31	34
Issue-oriented historical analysis of trends, concepts, problems, movements in education.	31	26
Survey of education from antiquity to modern times.	17	17
Exposition/analysis of major education *theorists* (e.g., Plato, Aristotle, Quintilian, Rousseau, Herbart, Mann, Dewey, Etc.)	17	11
"Other"	3	5
In-depth analysis of specific historical period and/or geographical region (e.g., the Progressive Era, development of national school systems, etc.)	2	3

TABLE 8. INSTRUCTION APPROACHES BY PERCENTAGES TO THE TEACHING OF COURSES IN COMPARATIVE/INTERNATIONAL EDUCATION

ORGANIZATION OF CONTENT/INSTRUCTIONAL APPROACH	% WITHIN CATEGORY	% OF TOTAL RESPONDENTS
"Structural" descriptions of and comparisons among, various national school systems among the less developed/developing/Third World countries and/or contrasts between "First/Second World" systems and "Third World" national systems.	30	11
Issue-oriented analysis in a comparative perspective (e.g., bilingualism, minority assimilation, access and attrition, etc.)	18	6
Development education; policy planning and development; educational problems of emergent nations	14	6
"Structural" descriptions of and comparisons among various national school systems (e.g., education in England, Germany, France, Soviet Union, United States, etc.) within developed countries.	14	6
Concept-oriented analysis in a comparative perspective (aims, goals, pedagogy, administrative format, curricula, etc.)	10	3
"Other"	8	5
"Functional" analysis of schooling in a comparative context or from an international perspective (e.g., the institution of schooling as social control, cultural imperialism, etc.)	6	7

The results reported here resist succinct narrative summary. Several cautionary notes are in order. First, the sample surveyed does not purport to be representative of all SCDE's; institutions included were larger, with correspondingly larger FTE's both in terms of faculty and student enrollments. Secondly, the sample was quite small, less than seven percent of all 1,033 possible schools, colleges, and departments engaged in teacher preparation (though the aggregate student population likely represents a not inconsiderable percentage of the total preparing for teacher certification). Thirdly, only 5 types of courses out of a total of those 14 most frequently offered were examined. The descripters used to refer to alternative organizational strategies were not necessarily mutually exclusive, and they undoubtedly were variously interpreted by respondents. The data in their present form fail to indicate course enrollments, the level at which courses are most commonly taught, or how many sections of a particular course are offered in a given year. Finally, the research design in this study made no provision for a cross-check for accuracy in any school's reporting; results in all cases simply reflect one person's judgments for each SCDE surveyed. Quite likely the percentage totals would have differed if it had been possible to sample the opinions of every foundational faculty member in each SCDE sampled.

These caveats notwithstanding, a few possible conclusions suggest themselves. First, where an SCDE's program requires only one foundation course, probabilities favor its being an omnibus multi-purpose survey of the field of education. Secondly, general foundations courses tend to be organized around issues, trends, or concepts in education; this approach predominates above all others. Thirdly, the teaching of philosophy of education still reflects, in the greatest percentage of cases, a "schools of thought" approach utilizing labels such as Idealism, Realism, Pragmatism, and so forth. Fourthly, larger SCDE's in the sample offer survey courses in the history of American education far more frequently than any other course of an historical character. Fifthly, the teaching of educational sociology typically is structured around sociological concepts or educational issues more than any other approach. On the average, less than a third of all large SCDE's offer instruction in comparative and/or international education. Lastly, the term "foundations of education" or its equivalent is a rubric for describing one component of courses, each of which may differ from others significantly in terms of subject matter or content, objectives, organization, and instructional approach.

SUMMARY OF CONCLUSIONS

The following general conclusions drawn from data generated by the two surveys in the present study appear defensible:

1. Wholly independent administrative units made up exclusively of faculty teaching courses in foundations of education are the exception rather than the rule. Even within larger SCDE's, foundations faculty share departmental identity with colleagues teaching other kinds of courses. No readily recognizable patterns predominate; foundations faculty are equally likely to be conjoined administratively with any other area of academic or professional specialization in Education. The term "foundations" is used more than twice as commonly all other administrative designations combined (e.g., "educational studies" or "educational policy studies").
2. Numbers of faculty FTE's in foundations vary greatly among SCDE's, ranging from less than a single FTE to 26 FTE's. On a percentage basis, an appreciable number engaged in undergraduate instruction in the area hold degrees in fields or areas other than those encompassed by the term "foundations."
3. The "typical" undergraduate pre-service teacher preparation program

leading to initial certification requires less than two 3-semester-hour courses in foundations of education. The median hour-requirement is 3-semester-hours or its equivalent. Most commonly the foundational coursework component is satisfied by completion of an "Introduction to Education" course, a general "Social Foundations of Education" course, or an "Issues And Trends/School and Society"-type course. Next in order of frequency is a required course in educational philosophy.

4. Over half of the SCDE's surveyed professed ignorance of the existence of a professional standard mandating that one course in every six required for certification have as its focus the development of interpretive, normative, and critical perspectives on education. Compliance is more common within programs for majors in secondary education than in those for elementary education majors. Only about one-third of all institutions reporting indicated that the required 16.6% of foundational coursework to total hours in professional education was met by their programs. Few respondents expected the situation to change within the immediate future.

5. In three out of every four SCDE's, students enroll in a single course in common in order to satisfy the foundational requirement. At larger institutions, students may select from upwards of two to five course alternatives.

6. Foundations faculty perceive themselves as enjoying good professional and personal relationships with colleagues in other sub-disciplines or areas of Education; and, generally, they report support from faculty peers for the courses they teach in foundations of education. These generalizations apply with least force to large public SCDE's. They further report supportive relations with Deans, Chairs, or other administrative superordinates.

7. Foundations faculty view their greatest collective strengths to derive from their scholarly expertise or academic excellence, their pedagogical competence, and from the intrinsic importance or relevance of what they teach. Their greatest shared concerns are declining student enrollments, lack of opportunities for continuing professional development, and, to a much lesser extent, a suspicion that society in general (and/or the SCDE in particular) neither appreciates nor understands adequately the contribution of foundations of education to teacher preparation.

8. Foundations faculty identify closely with professional academically-based teacher education. Less than one-third are involved in undergraduate instruction aimed at the preparation of educators for non-school settings. Most expect their primary institutional role will remain tied to teacher education.

9. Faculty in foundations are inclined to believe their course are well-received by students, and that student attitudes toward such courses grow more positive and supportive as a result of exposure to instruction

10. Persons teaching courses in the foundations of education tend to organize instruction around basic concepts and issues in education. Many favor an interdisciplinary or generalist approach which supercedes or transcends

specific disciplines. Less frequently do they attempt to structure courses so as to reflect directly the concepts, problems and concerns of teacher-educators in other areas. Comparatively few faculty identify closely with a cognate discipline such as history, philosophy, sociology, political science, and so on, except for academic specialists employed in large public SCDE's.

11. Almost half of all foundations faculty aim in their teaching at the promotion of broad theoretical understanding or "contextual" knowledge among students. About one-third seek to impart principles which, it is expected, can prove directive of educational policy and practice. Very few essay to instill any type of specific pedagogical expertise. The overwhelming majority view their instructional function as one of analysis rather than either simple description of educational phenomena or didactic advocacy of some partisan position.

12. The present "steady-state" economy of American higher education is reflected in microcosm within faculties in foundations of education. Almost one-fifth of all SCDE's surveyed experienced a net decline of faculty FTE's within the past three to five years, while almost three-quarters reported no change in the numbers of faculty FTE's. Looking to the future, almost 72% of all faculty respondents anticipate current faculty size will remain unchanged. Very few expect even modest growth to occur. Almost one-fifth foresee the likelihood of a net loss of faculty in foundations.

TABLE 9. MISCELLANEOUS UNDERGRADUATE COURSES IN FOUNDATIONS OF EDUCATION
OFFERED IN ORDER OF FREQUENCY BY 65 LARGE SCDE'S.

Course	%	Course	%
Multi-cultural/Multi-ethnic Education	31	School Organization and Management, Administration	9
Psychology ("humanistic", qualitative, non-behavioral, non-quantitative) and Education	17	Economics and Education	8
Human Relations Management/Interpersonal Relations	15	Religion and Education	6
Educational Anthropology	15	Aesthetics and Education	5
Urban Education	12	"Other"	4
Curriculum Theory	11		

SUGGESTIONS FOR FUTURE RESEARCH

Many questions remain unanswered from the present study. More detailed up-to-date information is needed on the status, extent, and content of the foundational component (e.g., "service" course) in graduate degree programs in Education. It also would be useful to know more about how graduate-degree programs in foundations are structured and administered. Follow-up studies of program graduates would allow more precise judgments on career patterns and employment possibilities in the field.

Likewise, at the undergraduate level more data would be helpful regarding the academic credentials and professional preparation of faculty involved in instruction, the level within the baccalaureate program at which certain types of foundational courses are most frequently offered, whether or not service courses carry prerequisites (suggestive perhaps of some sort of epistemic "progression" when two or more courses of the same general type are offered), the frequency with which teacher-candidates choose foundations courses on an elective basis, and so on. Especially helpful would be more detailed, comprehensive information on the kinds of instructional resources (including texts) which enjoy broadest acceptance within the field. The health, vitality and well-being of the profession, it might be argued, depend to some extent on the degree to which its practitioners are informed about common patterns, strengths, and weaknesses prevalent on a national scale in the teaching of courses in the foundations of education, educational studies, and educational policy studies.

NOTES

1. Alan H. Jones, *A Survey of Social Foundations of Education in the United States* (Unpublished manuscript, 1972).

2. Marie Wirsing, *Final Report: A Survey Of Graduate Degree Programs In Foundations Of Education In American And Canadian Institutions Of Higher Education* (Unpublished manuscript, 1976).

3. Christopher J. Lucas, "The Foundations Of Education Component In State Regulations Governing Teacher Preparation And Intitial Certification, *Educational Studies* 10 (Spring 1979): 1-29.

4. College Division, Barron's Educational Series, *Barron's Profiles of American Colleges* (11th ed.) I (Woodbury, N.Y.: Barron's Educational Series, 1978); Shirley S. Harris, ed., *Accredited Institutions of Postsecondary Education 1977-78* (Washington: American Council on Education, Council on Postsecondary Accreditation, 1978).

5. David L. Clark and Egon G. Guba, *A Study of Teacher Education Institutions as Innovators, Knowledge Producers and Change Agencies—Final Report* (Washington: National Institute of Education, 1977), Appendix B.

6. Unfortunately, it proved impractical to compensate for non-responses using, for example, the method of random replacement or inflation of data based on the inverse probability of a respondent's inclusion within the sample.

7. The basic formula relied upon was $N=(z/e)2(p)(1-p)$, where N is the sample size, z is the standard score corresponding to the 95 percent confidence level, and p is the estimated proportion or incidence of cases in the total population. Consult the relevant discussions in Bruce W. Tuckman, *Conducting Educational Research*. 2nd ed. (New York: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich, 1978), p. 232; J. William Asher, *Education Research and Evaluation Methods* (Boston: Little, Brown and Company, 1976), p. 160; and George A. Ferguson, *Statistical Analysis In Psychology & Education*. 3rd ed. (New York: McGraw-Hill, 1971), pp. 122-33.

8. Trends in the distribution of graduates with teaching certificates indicate that as of 1975-76 approximately 72% of all new teachers graduated from public institutions and 28% from private institutions. Numbers of *graduates* are preferable to *enrollment* figures for examining aggregate totals since the point at which an undergraduate declares a major (i.e., enrolls in a teacher preparation program) varies widely among institutions. Furthermore, many students preparing to teach secondary-level subjects formally major in those subjects, taking the professional education courses required for certification as electives. Hence numbers of graduates with teaching certificates represent more reliable figures than do enrollment totals. Note the discussion in Lewin and Associates, *The State of Teacher Education 1977: A Summary of the National Survey of the Preservice Preparation of Teachers* (Washington: National Center for Education Statistics, 1977), p. 27.

A random check of the relative percentages of recent college graduates (1978-79) who sought certification reveals on a state-by-state basis that almost three out of four were degree-holders from public colleges and universities. This information was secured by examining licensure records of 14 of the 22 states able to supply a break-down by recommending institutions. Seven states do not compile figures in this fashion. Twenty-one state departments of education failed to respond to the request for information. States supplying data included: Alabama, Alaska, Arizona, Colorado, Delaware, Indiana, Kentucky, Louisiana, Massachusetts, Michigan, Nebraska, New Hampshire, North Dakota, North Carolina, Ohio, Oregon, Pennsylvania, South Dakota, Texas, Utah, Virginia, and Washington. States who responded but were unable to supply figures included Florida, Hawaii, Kansas, Montana, Missouri, New Mexico, and Tennessee.

9. SCDE's from the Midwest and Northeast were slightly over-represented in the sample population and, conversely, those from the South and Northwest were under-represented. It should be noted that the *number* of institutions from a given geographical region offers an unreliable indicator of the aggregate student undergraduate population represented within the same geographic area. The geographical areas designated and the states included in each were as follows: (Northeast) Maryland, West Virginia, Pennsylvania, New Jersey, New York, Rhode Island, Connecticut, Massachusetts, Vermont, New Hampshire, Maine, and Delaware; (Midwest) Minnesota, Wisconsin, Iowa, Missouri, Illinois, Indiana, Ohio, and Michigan; (South) Louisiana, Arkansas, Mississippi, Alabama, Georgia, Florida, South Carolina, N. Carolina, Tennessee, Kentucky, and Virginia, (Rocky Mountains and Central Plains) Colorado, Kansas, Nebraska, South Dakota, North Dakota, Oklahoma; (Southwest) Arizona, New Mexico, Texas, and Hawaii; (West) Utah, Nevada, California; (Northwest) Washington, Oregon, Idaho, Montana, Wyoming, and Alaska.

10 Cf. Lewin and Associates, p. 27; Martin Haberman and T. N. Stinnett, *Teacher Education and the New Profession of Teaching* (Berkeley: McCutchan, 1973).

11. AESA Task Force On Academic Standards, *Standards For Academic And Professional Instruction In Foundations Of Education, Educational Studies And Educational Policy Studies*, appearing in *Educational Studies* 8 (Winter 1977-78): 336-37.

12. *Ibid.*, pp. 337, 340-342.

13. A total of 65 institutions, or 17.1% of the total sample, reported offering programs in foundations leading to the specialist and/or masters degrees.

14. In the actual survey itself, however, the actual percentage of respondents checking "Other" exceeded the established criterion within two out of six course categories.

From: Educational Studies 10 (Spring, 1979) 1-29.

Articles

THE FOUNDATIONS OF EDUCATION COMPONENT IN STATE REGULATIONS GOVERNING TEACHER PREPARATION AND INITIAL CERTIFICATION*

CHRISTOPHER J. LUCAS
University of Missouri-Columbia

INTRODUCTION

This study represents an attempt to examine the foundations of education component within state regulations governing the initial certification of teachers and teacher preparatory programs.

The importance of state teacher education requirements ought not to be underestimated. They figure as one set of factors among many which affect employment for educational foundations scholars—at least for the majority whose academic appointments are connected with the work of teacher education. It is true, of course, that the place of foundations of education within any given institution's teacher preparatory program depends most directly upon decisions controlled by faculty. Any number of academic as well as non-academic judgments figure in the equation. Political factors in terms of departmental rivalries and tacit "trade-offs" also help shape curricula. In a still broader sense, standards advanced by external accreditation agencies exert an influence over a program. Ultimately, however, the political (if not academic) legitimacy of most program components, including foundations of education, is traceable back to what is mandated by minimum state norms.[1]

Guidelines and standards issued by accreditation organizations are largely formal in character. The National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education (NCATE), for example, does not specify any precise courses or programs required for teacher certification; it is officially committed to variation and experimentation in program development. With respect to basic teacher education programs, two standards are of possible relevance—one mandates the inclusion of multicultural education in teacher education curricula. Another requires within the "professional studies" component of each curriculum instruction in "humanistic studies and the behavioral studies." Standard 2.3.2 disavows any particular organizational structure for such instruction. The explanatory rationale for the standard reads in part as follows:

---

*THIS SURVEY WAS UNDERTAKEN ON BEHALF OF THE COORDINATING COUNCIL FOR LEARNED SOCIETIES IN EDUCATION. THE AUTHOR ASSUMES SOLE RESPONSIBILITY FOR THE ACCURACY OF THE FINDINGS AND THE CONCLUSIONS OR RECOMMENDATIONS OFFERED.

> It is assumed that problems concerning the nature and aims of education, the curriculum, the organization and administration of a school system, and the process of teaching and learning can be studied with respect to their historical development and the related philosophical issues .... The problems of education can also be studied with respect to the findings and methods of psychology, sociology, anthropology, economics, and political science .... Instruction in these studies may be offered in such courses as history and/or philosophy of education, educational sociology, psychology of education or as an integral part of such courses as history, philosophy, psychology, sociology, or as topics in foundation courses, problems in education courses, or . . . as independent reading.[2]

No mention is made of a foundational component in teacher education within the guidelines developed by the Northwest Association of Schools and Colleges or by the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools. A document issued by the Commission on Schools of the North Central Association of Colleges and Schools recommends eighteen semester hours of coursework, "to include areas of learning process, measurement, philosophy, psychology, social foundations, and curriculum."[3] The guidelines of the National Association of State Directors of Teacher Education and Certification (NASDTEC) are similarly vague. Standard II.0 under Section 3.3 (Chapter III) states simply that a teacher education program should help develop "understanding of the foundations underlying the development and organization of education in the United States."[4] For whatever greater degree of specificity exists in mandating foundations of education coursework, one must turn rather to state teacher regulations.

Teacher certification is a legal function exercised by each of the fifty states of the United States rather than by the federal or local governments. Only on the most fundamental criteria do states agree. All states require that prospective teachers obtain a license, certificate, or permit in order to work in public schools. Virtually all states require at least a bachelor's degree for permanent certification at the elementary and secondary levels. General education requirements usually outline a broad pattern of coursework that encompasses a range of academic disciplines or subjects. Also required (with one or two exceptions) is a sequence of professional education courses varying from ten to fifty or more semester hours of credit (depending upon the certification level sought), plus supervised clinical and/or field experiences (e.g., micro-teaching, classroom observation, internships, and student teaching).[5]

Otherwise the states remain in disagreement. Hodenfield and Stinnet have observed that any history of teacher certification in the United States has to be "a chronicle of chaos."[6] Much the same judgment applies in the attempt to summarize the variety of regulations and the various types of teaching licenses issued by states today.[7] No standard nomenclature has won common acceptance for describing the many different types of teaching certificates that exist. Certificates differ with respect to the amount of training required, in the number and character of conditions stipulated for their renewal, and the periods of time for which they are valid. Not only is there diversity among states, but there is also great complexity within each state. Most issue a multitude of teacher certificates differing from one another in the qualifications they require, the scope of teaching positions and types of schools to which they apply, and the length of time during which they retain their validity.[8]

For the puposes of this survey, data were collected only as they pertain to common professional education requirements for the "initial" or "standard" teaching permit (as distinguished from probationary, emergency, or limited certificates) for early childhood specialists (where a separate endorsement is offered) elementary school teachers, middle school teachers (if specified), and secondary school teachers.

Complicating matters still further is the fact that state certification regulations are themselves organized in very different ways. That is, not only are they dissimilar regarding the conditions attached for entrance into the teaching profession, but also in terms of how the conditions are set forth. Three basic patterns predominate. Some states specify completion of particular courses and minimum numbers of credit hours for each course (or for groupings of courses under area or topical headings). Other states outline in more general terms an appropriate organization of content matter within an "approved" teacher preparatory program. Still others simply state that the certification applicant must have finished an "approved" program of studies. In the latter case, criteria governing state endorsement of a program typically are not spelled out in any great detail, if at all.

Some states employing an "approved program" approach require only that a program conform to the general guidelines of regional or national accrediting agencies. A few states use internal policy documents devised by their respective state boards or commissions of education.[9] In two or three cases, states use an "approved institution" approach and identify the colleges or universities by name. Finally, regulations in several states combine the three basic organizational patterns.

State regulations are revised at irregular intervals. In order to secure the most recent data, a request for a copy of current rules was submitted to the department of education in each of the fifty states. Seven states failed to supply the information requested: Georgia, Florida, Louisiana, Massachusetts, Tennessee, West Virginia, and Delaware. In these seven cases, summaries of state requirements were obtained from the compilation published yearly by the former Board of Vocational Guidance (now Career Counseling and Placement) of the University of Chicago, and checked against the most recent issue of the National Education Association's *A Manual on Standards Affecting School Personnel in the United States*, which is revised and up-dated every three years.[10]

The term "foundations of education," as defined in standards adopted by the American Educational Studies Association, refers to "a broadly-conceived field of study that derives its character and fundamental theories from a number of academic disciplines, combinations of disciplines, and area studies: history, philosophy, sociology, anthropology, religion, political science, economics, psychology, comparative and international education, educational studies, and educational policy studies." The basic purpose of such studies is stated to be "the development of interpretive, normative, and critical perspectives on education . . . . "[11]

The operational definition employed in this study is at once more stringent and more inclusive than that supplied in the AESA standards. It is broader in that locutions such as "school and society" or "current issues in education" or "multicultural education" or "orientation to education," listed as topics or course titles in state policy documents, are taken to refer to studies which could be "foundational" in character. The definition is more restrictive in that "psychology of education" is somewhat arbitrarily excluded unless the designator is conjoined with another modifier for "foundations," e.g., "psychological and philosophical foundations of education." Likewise excluded are descriptors such as "curriculum" or "theory of the school curriculum."

What follows is a state-by-state summary of the relevant portions of the professional studies components prescribed for teacher education programs and/or cited as prerequisites for initial certification.

SUMMARY OF STATE REQUIREMENTS AND GUIDELINES

ALABAMA

Existing requirements are currently under revision and draft documents are unavailable. Certification requires, minimally, a bachelor's degree from an accredited institution and completion of a program in education approved by the National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education (NCATE) or the National Association of State Directors of Teacher Education and Certification (NASDTEC).

ALASKA

Completion of an "approved" program (in conformity with NASDTEC Standards).

ARIZONA

Elementary. Twenty-four semester hours distributed among each of the following: (a) student teaching or evidence of two years of successful teaching in any grade K-8; (b) curriculum and methods of teaching subjects, to include one course in each of the following: reading, decoding skills, reading practicum (including decoding skills), language arts, science, and arithmetic; and (c) psychological and philosophical foundations.

Secondary. Twenty-two semester hours distributed among each of the following: (a) student teaching or two years of successful teaching experience in grades 7-12; (b) curriculum and methods of teaching at the secondary level, plus one course in reading (including decoding skills) and one reading practicum (including decoding skills); (c) psychological and philosophical foundations.

ARKANSAS

Elementary. Eighteen semester hours of elementary education, including: (a) study of the school; (b) of the learning processes; and (c) of elementary teaching, including a methods course in reading; and (d) six hours of directed teaching.

Elementary Guidance Counselor. Three semester hours in "elementary school child and society."

Secondary. Eighteen semester hours of education, including: (a) study of the school; (b) study of the learning processes; (c) study of teaching; and (d) six semester hours of directed teaching.

CALIFORNIA

The Ryan Act specifically excludes a baccalaureate degree in professional education as a qualification for certification, although under certain circumstances, the state extends reciprocity to applicants from some other states who have completed a program of professional preparation approved by the State Commission or the state certification agency of the state in which the program was completed.

COLORADO

Early Childhood Endorsement. Requires a component described as follows: "Studies to develop knowledge and skills in the area of (a) the influence of the family, the school, the community, and other social and political institutions on the child's development . . . and (b) the evolution of early childhood as it relates to the total educational system and interrelated social processes."

Elementary and Secondary. Completion of "an approved program of professional education of an accepted institution of higher education" which must develop "knowledge and skills" in the area of "Foundations and professionalism," which is described as follows: "(1) . . . history, philosophy, financing, and organization of the public elementary and secondary schools. (2) Background information regarding the professional educators as a facilitator [*sic*] of learning, liaison with community, and kinds of professional organizations and their functions. (3) The legal aspects of a changing educational scene, such as the legal rights and due process of students, [*sic*], parents, teachers, administrators, and school boards. (4) Current issues in education such as educational accountability, teacher tenure, collective bargaining, grievances, and grievance procedures."

CONNECTICUT

Elementary. Requires "a comprehensive pattern of professional experience" consisting of thirty semester hours of coursework including (1) educational psychology, (2) curriculum and methods of teaching (must include three semester hours in teaching developmental reading in elementary school and three semester hours in children's literature, and may include: methods of teaching; audio-visual aids in instruction; individualizing instruction; educational measurements; the curriculum at a particular level; principles of curriculum construction; curriculum in one specific field; and extracurricular activities); (3) supervised observation, participation, and full-time responsible student teaching (six to twelve semester hours, or one year of successful teaching experience); (4) guidance; (5) health and safety education; and (6) Foundations of Education. This group includes such areas as: (a) history of education, (b) principles of education, (c) philosophy of education, (d) comparative education, and (e) community sociology, community resources, social anthropology.

Secondary. Eighteen hours in six areas, as described (with minor changes) for elementary certification.

DELAWARE

Professional education requirements include clinical and/or field experiences (including student teaching), human behavior and/or child development, psychology of learning, teaching of reading, and curriculum and methods, but make no mention of a "foundations" component.

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Early Childhood. Requirements include (optional) coursework in "teacher, child, family and community interaction; [and] philosophy of education of the young child" as two areas covered in a minimum eighteen semester hour pattern.

Elementary and Secondary. A course in "sociology of urban youth."

FLORIDA

Elementary and Secondary. A total of six hours in both "sociological and psychological foundations," from a total of twenty-three hours of general professional requirements, including three hours of student teaching.

GEORGIA

Elementary and Secondary. Ten quarter hours from a total of thirty quarter hours of professional education are required in "foundations of education; curriculum and methods; and elementary student teaching or an approved substitute."

HAWAII

Certification is granted upon completion of an institution's state-approved teacher education program.

IDAHO

Elementary. Eighteen semester hours in philosophical, psychological, and methodological foundations of education.

Secondary. Fourteen semester hours in philosophical, psychological, and methodological foundations of education.

ILLINOIS

Two semester hours from a total of sixteen are required in history and/or philosophy of education.

INDIANA

Elementary. Eighteen semester hours in the "professional education area" are required. The area "will be designed to introduce the candidate to the field of professional education; to develop understanding of human growth and development, and knowledge and competence relative to physical and mental health; to develop an understanding of philosophy, curriculum and evaluation as related to public education, including early childhood education; and to develop an understanding of professionalized content and skills used in teaching elementary school subjects." This formulation apparently supercedes an earlier requirement of thirty semester hours of professional education, described as follows: "To include foundations of education; educational psychology; methods and materials; specific and continuing pre-student teaching field experience; classroom management; developmental, diagnostic and corrective reading (6 semester hours); educational measurement and evaluation; ethnic, cultural and disability awareness; 9 weeks of full-time student teaching . . . . "

Junior High/Middle School. The 1978-79 edition of Woellner lists a twenty-seven hour professional education requirement "to include foundations of education; educational psychology; methodology and oranization; special methods; sociology of education; classroom management; reading; laboratory experience; and 9 weeks of student teaching at appropriate level."

Secondary. State department documents describe a requirement of twelve semester hours in "psychological foundations" in terms of "American Public Education, Methods in Teaching Area, Role of the Teacher." Woellner cites the requirement reproduced above under

"Junior High/Middle School Education (Departmentalized Grades 5-9)" certification.

IOWA

Effective August 31, 1980, a baccalaureate or postbaccalaureate teacher preparatory program offered by a "recognized" Iowa institution must include a "human relations" component which should be designed to develop the ability of participants "to be aware of and understand the various values, life styles, history, and contributions of various identifiable subgroups in our society . . . and to recognize and deal with dehumanizing biases such as sexism, racism, prejudice, and discrimination, and become aware of the impact that such biases have on interpersonal relations." Human relations study shall include "interpersonal and intergroup relations and shall contribute to the development of sensitivity to and understanding of the values, beliefs, life styles, and attitudes of individuals and the diverse groups found in a pluralistic society."

Certification applicants currently must hold a degree from an NCATE accredited institution or from an institution offering an Iowa teacher education program. At present, details of the substantive component elements of the professional education portion of an approved program are unspecified.

KANSAS

Early Childhood. Twenty-four semester hours of professional credit, of which twelve semester hours of early childhood education are "to include philosophy of education of young children; role of the nursery teacher, program content and materials; and supervised observation, participation, and teaching with children—primarily 3-and 4-year olds." Included must be six semester hours of coursework "dealing with the cultural environment and the individual, to include teacher-family-child-community interaction; urban and rural life; family relationships, parent education; community organization and leadership; and the sociology of poverty and wealth."

KENTUCKY

The state follows an "approved program" approach to certification. An approved program must have in its professional studies component "humanistic studies and the behavioral studies" (i.e., conforms to the relevant NCATE standard); elsewhere defined as twelve to eighteen semester hours of "pre-professional preparation" which includes "foundations of philosophy, psychology, sociology, and anthropology." Among the "professional requirements" appearing in "a general outline for program planning by the college" is a two to six-hour sequence entitled "introduction to education and/or school organization."

LOUISIANA

Elementary and Secondary. Three out of a total of twenty-four semester hours in "history of education, introducation to education, foundations of education, and/or philosophy of education."

MAINE

Elementary. Thirty hours of professional education courses, including not less than six in supervised or laboratory teaching experiences, to include the following areas: (a) knowledge of learner and learning process; (b) methods and techniques of teaching; and (c) "knowledge of the educational context or system."

Secondary. Eighteen hours of professional education courses, including student teaching, in the same areas prescribed for elementary certification.

MARYLAND

Elementary. Twenty-six semester hours in a "planned program of professional education," including six in "foundations of education, including a course in psychological foundations of education."

Secondary. Six out of eighteen hours of professional education courses in "foundations of education, including a course in psychological foundations of education."

MASSACHUSETTS

Elementary. Eighteen hours of professional requirements, including two in supervised student teaching in elementary schools (grades K-6), and coursework in two or more of the following areas: (a) curriculum development in elementary education; (b) methods and materials in elementary education; (c) educational psychology, including child growth and development; and (d) philosophy of education.

Secondary. Twelve hours of professional requirements, including two in supervised student teaching in secondary schools (grades 7-12), and coursework in two or more of the following areas: (a) curriculum development in secondary education; (b) methods and materials in secondary education; (c) educational psychology, including adolescent growth and development; and (d) philosophy of education.

MICHIGAN

Certification requires completion of a specific teacher preparation program from an approved teacher education institution. Woellner lists requirements as follows:

Elementary. Twenty hours of professional requirements, to include: (a) six hours in directed teaching and laboratory experiences in elementary grades; (b) "principles of teaching, or equivalent; (c) psychology of education, or equivalent: (d) history of education, philosophy of education, or equivalent; (e) methods in elementary subjects; (f) electives . . . ."

Secondary. Requirements are the same (with minor alterations) in (a) and (e) as for elementary certification.

MINNESOTA

The state follows an "approved program" approach to certification.

MISSISSIPPI

Elementary. Eighteen hours of professional elementary education coursework, including human growth and development, reading in elementary grades, language arts, directed teaching, and electives in methods in health, physical education and safety; audio-visual education methods; individual and group testing; curriculum development in elementary grades; and general elementary methods. No foundations coursework is required.

Secondary. Eighteen hours of professional education, to include: educational psychology; human growth and development or adolescent psychology; "principles of teaching in high school"; secondary methods course related to teaching field; and directed teaching in secondary field. No other foundations coursework is required.

MISSOURI

Early Childhood. From a total of sixty hours of professional requirements, ten hours must be selected in "Foundations for Teaching" in eight areas, with two or more hours in (a) early childhood growth and development, and (b) psychology and education of the exceptional child. Other areas include: "foundations of education and school organization and management; personalized teaching strategies; self awareness and human relations; psychology of learning, and behavior management techniques (interpersonal relationships) [*sic*]" (Adopted 6/22/78).

Elementary (grades 1-8). Same requirements for certification as for early childhood, except that the only required area is "psychology and education of the exceptional child" (Adopted 6/22/78).

Middle School/Junior High (grades 4-9). Sixty hours of professional requirements, of which a minimum of ten must be selected in "Foundations for Teaching," including two or more hours in psychology and education of the exceptional child and in adolescent psychology or psychology of the transescent child. Other areas include: (a) "foundations of education; (b) middle school-junior high philosophy, organization, and curriculum; (c) personalized teaching strategies; (d) self awareness and human relations; (e) child growth and development; (f) psychology of learning; (g) techniques of classroom management; and (h) tests and measurements" (Adopted 6/22/78).

Secondary. Regulations are under revision. Current requirements call for a minimum of eighteen hours of professional education coursework, to include two to three in an area described as "the school: history or philosophy of education, high school administration, high school curriculum, tests and measurements, etc."

MONTANA

The state follows an "approved program" approach to certification.

NEBRASKA

The state follows an "approved program" approach to certification.

NEVADA

Elementary. Thirty hours of elementary professional education, to include six hours of supervised teaching; eight hours of teaching methods, not including reading; six hours of teaching of reading, reading skills, and phonics skills; and three hours of "multicultural education."

Secondary. Twenty hours of secondary professional education, to include six hours of supervised teaching and/or teaching internship; thirteen hours in courses in methods and materials in field of specialization; and three hours of "multicultural education."

NEW HAMPSHIRE

The state follows an "approved program" approach to certification.

NEW JERSEY

All Levels. Fifteen hours in professional education, not including student teaching, distributed over four of eight areas (including electives). Within the eight areas, three are required: educational psychology, human and intercultural relations, and methods of teaching. Among the remaining five areas, one is described as "Foundations of Education. Studies designed to develop understanding of the educational implications of . . . [the] social, political, historical, cultural, and philosophical context in which schools are conducted, including courses such as the following: history of education, philosophy of education, social foundations of education, comparative education, and educational sociology."

NEW MEXICO

Elementary. Eighteen hours of a total of twenty-four hours of professional education (including six hours of student teaching) distributed over at least three of the following: human growth and development; areas related to school counseling; methods and techniques; educational psychology; and "orientation in education."

Secondary. Twelve hours of a total of eighteen hours of professional education (including six hours of student teaching) distributed over a minimum of three of the following five areas: human growth and development; areas related to school counseling; methods and techniques; educational psychology; and "orientation in education."

NEW YORK

The state follows an "approved program" approach to certification.

NORTH CAROLINA

Early Childhood and Intermediate School. The state mandates a "competency-based" approach to teacher certification. Requirements call for approximately twenty to twenty-five percent of a four-year program to be devoted to the production of "professional competencies," in each of five areas: growth patterns and learning styles of young children and youth; organizational patterns and working relationships for use in developing learning environments; materials, strategies, techniques, tools and activities for early childhood and middle school settings; personal attributes and attitudes that promote interaction between teacher and learner; and "contemporary issues and trends in education from a historical, philosophical, and sociological standpoint."

This last area is further characterized as follows: "(a) understanding of the historical and continuing role of the school as a social institution in American society; (b) understanding of philosophies of education and their implications for the education of young children and youth; (c) understanding of the role of government (local, state, and national) in determining the scope, shape, and direction of public education; (d) understanding of the contemporary purposes served by education for both the individual and society; and (e) understanding of the cultural aspects of education including its influence on values and constant social-technological change."

Elsewhere, under guideline #3 for preparing teachers, an approved "professional studies" program is required to "provide study of the contemporary issues and trends in education within a historical, philosophical, and sociological framework. The document further explains: "Content in this area should promote an understanding of the changing role of the school as an institution in a rapidly changing society; philosophies of education and their implications for early childhood and middle school programs; and the influence of government and the social environment in all of their aspects on the scope, shape, and direction of education. The need for a closer working relationship between school and community should be emphasized."

Secondary. Within the guidelines for the "professional studies" component of a teacher preparatory program appears the following: "The professional studies component should provide humanistic study of the problems, issues and trends in education within a historical, philosophical, sociological, economic, and govermental framework."

The amplification reads as follows: "The overall study under this guideline may be identified as being behavioral and humanistic in nature. The major purpose of the study is to provide the student with a set of human [*sic*] and theoretical contexts in which living and learning problems can be understood and interpreted. It is assumed that problems regarding the nature and aims of education, the curriculum, and the organization and administration of a school system will be studied with respect to their historical development and the philosophical issues to which they are related. In the same studies, the problems of education should be studied from an interdisciplinary standpoint to include the findings of sociology, economics, political science, anthropology, and other related disciplies."

Under guideline #5 for a teacher preparatory program, the text states that the program "should provide the prospective teacher with the knowledge and experiences needed to free him [*sic*] from dogmatic superstitions and prejudices concerning race, ethnic groups, and economic status, plus the knowledge and skills that will enable him [*sic*] to (1) cope with the school situations and problems that reflect social stresses and strains and (2) plan and conduct learning activities that promote the acceptance of cultural and human diversity, the development of positive self-images and the recognition of each individual as a fellow human being possessing rights to be recognized and respected by others."

NORTH DAKOTA

The state follows an "approved program" approach to certification.

OHIO

Elementary. Twenty-nine semester hours (or forty-four quarter hours) of professional education are required, with coursework distributed as follows: (a) understanding the learner and the learning process (six hours); (b) "school in relation to society" (three hours); and (c) elementary school curriculum: methods, including teaching of reading; laboratory experience, including student teaching (twenty hours).

Secondary. Twenty-one semester hours (or thirty-two quarter hours) of professional education are required, and should include: (a) understanding the learner and the learning process (three hours); (b) "school in relation to society" (three hours); and (c) secondary school curriculum: methods and laboratory experience, including student teaching in field in which certification is sought (fifteen hours).

OKLAHOMA

Early Childhood. Twenty-one hours of professional education required, with coursework in each of the following: (a) childhood growth and development, conception-six years; (b) "social foundations of education"; (c) educational psychology; (d) student teaching (minimum of 6 hours); and (e) electives from above areas or in other approved early childhood education courses. A course (two-three hours) in psychology of exceptional children is also required within the twenty-one hour total.

Elementary. With appropriate minor adjustments, the requirements are the same as for early childhood certification.

Secondary. The "standard" certificate mandates the same requirements as for elementary certification; "professional" certification requires eight graduate semester hours of professional education in such areas as: "problems of teaching, materials and methods, curriculum development, philosophical and historical foundations, guidance, human development, research, and statistics."

OREGON

Elementary. Basic endorsement (valid three years): thirty-six quarter hours of elementary teacher education coursework, distributed among the following: (a) teaching strategies with emphasis on development of measurable objectives and diagnostic and prescriptive techniques; (b) six quarter hours in methods of teaching reading; (c) use of educational teaching media; (d) "social and cultural foundations, including an understanding and appreciation of the role of minority groups in American society"; (e) psychological foundations including child, adolescent and educational psychology, and group processes; and (f) elementary supervised teaching and/or internship.

"Standard" certification (valid for five years) adds a requirement of fifteen quarter hours more in any three of the following: behavior modification, curriculum, early childhood education, education of the exceptional child, evaluation of learning, guidance and counseling, interpersonal relations, occupational or career awareness, "philosophy and/or history of education, social foundations of education."

Secondary. Basic endorsement (valid three years): thirty quarter hours of secondary teacher education coursework, distributed among the same areas cited for elementary (basic) certification, with minor adjustments as appropriate to secondary education. (Secondary-standard certification adds no additional requirements in foundations of education.)

PENNSYLVANIA

The state follows an "approved program" approach to certification.

RHODE ISLAND

The state follows an "approved program" approach to certification.

SOUTH CAROLINA

Early Childhood. Twenty-four hours in seven areas, as follows: (a) child growth and development or child psychology; (b) behavior of the preschool child, including observation and participation; (c) "principles and/or philosophy of education (courses in this area should bring about some understanding of the theories of learning, motivation, and the general philosophy of American education)"; (d) elementary school materials, curricula or general methods; (e) teaching of reading; (f) methods and materials; and (g) six hours of directed teaching.

Elementary. Twenty-one hours in five areas, as follows: (a) child growth and development or child psychology; (b) "principles and/or philosophy of education"; (c) elementary school materials, curriculum, or general elementary school methods; (d) teaching of reading; and (e) six hours of directed teaching.

Middle School: Includes three hours in "foundations of education."

Secondary. Eighteen hours in four areas: (a) adolescent growth and development or adolescent psychology; (b) "principles and/or philosophy of education"; (c) principles of learning, secondary school materials, curricula, methods; and (d) six hours of directed teaching.

SOUTH DAKOTA

The state follows an "approved program" approach to certification, but effective 7/17/78, has instituted standards which set forth in detail the minimum numbers of hours in both subject areas and education courses. Six hours of educational psychology are required for an elementary certificate and a minimum of two hours for secondary certification. No specific foundational work in education is mandated at any certification level.

TENNESSEE

All levels. Twenty-four hours of professional education, including a minimum of four hours of supervised student teaching, materials and methods appropriate to the level of certification, specialized requirements, and two "core professional requirements" consisting of psychological foundations of education (human growth and development, learning, measurement, evaluation, and guidance) and "historical, philosophical, and sociological foundations of American education, with attention to the teacher's role in the school and community."

TEXAS

The state follows an "approved program" approach to certification.

UTAH

The state follows an "approved program" approach to certification.

VERMONT

The state follows an "approved program" approach to certification.

VIRGINIA

Certification endorsements, while detailed in their requirements, make no mention of foundational work in education.

WASHINGTON

The state follows an "approved program" approach to certification.

WEST VIRGINIA

Certification requires a minimum of twenty hours of professional education, the content for which is left unspecified.

WISCONSIN

Certification requires a professional education sequence of twenty-six and eighteen hours, respectively, at the elementary or secondary level. Foundational coursework within this sequence is neither required nor mentioned among the recommended content areas. However, for teachers of the handicapped, a mandatory eighteen-hour professional education sequence encompassing fifteen possible areas, of which five are obligatory, mentions "history of education" and "educational sociology" as electives to satisfy the total hour requirement.

WYOMING

Elementary. Twenty-three hours of professional preparation are required, including mandatory coursework in each of the following areas: foundations of education, human development and psychology, curriculum, methods, and directed teaching.

Secondary. Twenty hours of professional preparation, distributed among the same areas.

DISCUSSION OF FINDINGS

Eighteen states, or thirty-six percent of the total, rely mainly on an "approved program" or "approved institution" approach to initial teacher certification. Where these states differ is in the detail with which they set forth, respectively, substantive criteria to which teacher preparatory programs must conform in order to secure state approval. Alabama, for example, requires only that a program adhere to NCATE or NASDTEC standards. Alaska's regulations invoke the NASDTEC guidelines. Hawaii and Kentucky require approved programs in conformity with NCATE standards. In the latter case, however, the elements of an approved program are spelled out at considerable length. Vermont stresses guidelines issued by its own Board of Education, as does Texas. Other states cite regulations issued by regional consortia or accreditation organizations. In a few cases, a state's rules are wholly formal in character; that is, they are concerned exclusively with *procedures* governing the submission of programs for state approval. One or two states specify programs offered by particular school or colleges within the state, as in the case of Minnesota where institutions are cited by name.

Seven states, or fourteen percent of the total, mandate specific courses for initial certification, but omit any reference whatsoever to foundations of education among them. These states include California, Delaware, Mississippi, South Dakota, Virginia, West Virginia, and Wisconsin. New Mexico's regulations include a brief reference to coursework described as "orientation in education."

Nine states, eighteen percent of the total, mandate a specific minimum number of hours in foundations of education. The states are: Florida, Illinois, Kansas, Kentucky, Louisiana, Maryland, Missouri, Nevada, and Ohio. Florida, for example, requires a total of 6 hours in "sociological and psychological foundations of education, including a course in psychological foundations of education." Illinois mandates two hours of "history and/or philosophy of education." The average minimum total of required hours among the nine states is four. However, if psychology of education and other designations with which "foundations" are often conjoined under a single rubric in state regulations are eliminated, the mean hour total would likely be considerably less.

A more meaningful way of interpreting certification rules in these nine states is to examine the minimum hour total of coursework in foundations, first, as a percentage of the total hours in professional education required for certification and, secondly, as a percentage of the total hours required to complete a typical baccalaureate-degree program. Several variables enter into the calculations: (1) the level of certification involved; (2) the number of hours mandated for student teaching and other field experiences; and (3) the hour total of required professional education coursework. Thus, for example, elementary-level certification in Louisiana requires three hours in foundations, as part of a minimum total of thirty-seven hours of professional education coursework, of which six are devoted to student teaching. The three-hour foundations requirement therefore represents 9.1 percent of the professional education sequence, and 9.6 percent of the total if the six hours of student teaching are excluded from consideration.

The same three-hour foundations coursework requirement amounts to only 2.5 percent of the total number of credit hours called for (usually 120) in completing a baccalaureate-degree program. Excluding the 6 hours generated by student teaching, the percentage rises only slightly, to 2.6 percent.

In Kansas, six hours which are supposed to be directed "toward understanding the school as a social institution . . ." are obligatory within a minimum total of twenty four hours of professional education. Included within the twenty four are eight hours of student teaching. Assuming for illustrative purposes that the six-hour foundational requirement is fulfilled by completing two or more courses in foundations of education, those same courses represent twenty-five percent or one-fourth of the total professional preparation sequence. If the eight hours of student teaching are omitted, the foundations coursework amounts to 37.5 percent, or more than one-third of the total professional coursework mandated. These totals become less impressive, however, when computed against the 120-hour total. Excluding hours devoted to student teaching (8), the foundations work represents less than six percent of the total degree program, and if student teaching hours are included, only five percent. Table 1 summarizes the data from the nine states which mandate a specific course or a fixed number of coursework hours in foundations.

TABLE 1

THE FOUNDATIONS COMPONENT WITHIN STATE CERTIFICATION REQUIREMENTS MANDATING DETERMINATE COURSES AND/OR HOURS

STATE	CERTIFICATION LEVEL	HOURS OF REQUIRED FOUNDATIONS	DESCRIPTION OF "FOUNDATIONS" COMPONENT	PROF ED TOTALS (MINUS STUDENT TEACHING)	FOUNDATIONS PERCENTAGE[2]	INCLUSIVE PROF ED TOTALS[3]	FOUNDATIONS PERCENTAGE[4]
Florida	elem. sec.	6 6	Sociological and Psychological foundations	20 20	30. 30.	23 23	26. 26.
Illinois	elem. sec.	2 2	History and/or philosophy of education	11 11	18. 18.	16 16	12.5 12.5
Kentucky	elem. sec.	2-6 2-6	Introduction to education and/or school organization	16 9	12.5-37.5 22.2-66.6	24 17	8.3-25. 11.7-35.2
Kansas	elem. sec.	6 6	School as social institution	16 12	37.5 50.0	24 20	25.0 30.0
Louisiana	elem. sec.	3 3	History of education, introduction to education, foundations of education and/or philosophy of education	31 12	9.6 25.0	37 18	8.1 16.6
Maryland	elem. sec.	6 6	Foundations of education, including a course in psychological foundations	18 10	33.3 60.0	26 18	23.0 33.0
Missouri		2-3	The school: history or philosophy of education, high school administration, high school curriculum, tests and measurements, etc.	13	15.3-23.0	18	11.1-16.6
Nevada	elem. sec.	3 3	Multicultural education	12 16	25.0 18.7	18 22	16.6 13.6
Ohio	elem. sec.	3 3	School in relation to society	18 18	16.6 16.6	* *	* *

Key:

[1] Total minimum required hours of professional education coursework, *exclusive of* student teaching hours

[2] Foundational coursework as a percentage of minimum total of required professional education coursework, *excluding* student teaching hours

[3] Total minimum required hours of professional education coursework, *including* student teaching hours

[4] Foundational coursework as a percentage of minimum total of required professional education coursework, *including* student teaching hours.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

In considering these totals, it is important to note that the all-inclusive term "foundations of education" as it is commonly employed in state regulations is used very loosely or is made to encompass far more elements than are ordinarily included in conventional definitions of the field. Table 2 displays the variety of official locutions as they appear in state regulations. Secondary-level certification requirements in Missouri, to cite a case in point, include within "foundations" the following: "history or philosophy of education; high school administration; high school curriculum; tests and measurements; etc." Again, Ohio mentions "[the] school in relation to society," whereas Kentucky describes the designation in terms of "introduction to education and/or school organization," and at least two states—Maryland and Florida—include "psychological foundations" under the same general heading of foundations of education.

Much the same difficulty attends any attempt to identify the foundational component within certification regulations organized differently. Idaho, for example, requires fourteen hours in "philosophical, psychological, and methodological foundations of education," but without specifying how the hours are to be distributed. Wyoming mandates fifteen hours in "foundations of education, human development and psychology, methods and directed teaching." Almost as inclusive is the language appearing in the certification rules of Connecticut where "foundations of education" are defined permissively as "history of education; principles of education; philosophy of education; comparative education; and community sociology, community resources, [and] social anthropology."

A common usage in state standards is to cite foundational work as an "area" appearing within a much broader listing or sequence of professional education courses. Rather than specifying a given course or a minimum number of hours, the approved program pattern simply stipulates the *total* number of hours that must be completed, with coursework distributed among anywhere from three to eight different discrete topical areas. At least sixteen states organize their rules under this format. Sometimes an indeterminate number of hours and/or courses is required, *i.e.*, the student *must* select coursework designated by the "foundations of education" or "psychological and philosophical foundations." No particular courses have to be selected or minimum hour requirements met. Four states (Oregon, New Mexico, New Jersey, and Massachusetts) allow a pattern of distribution within which, for all practical purposes, the foundations area is elective. In other words, with judicious selection, a student can satisfy the total hour requirement without having completed a foundations course. In several states, regulations are drawn in a fashion such that it is virtually impossible to ascertain whether foundational work, when it appears, is intended to be obligatory or merely optional.

Another difficulty concerns the not inconsiderable number of areas

TABLE 2

DESIGNATORS FOR THE FOUNDATIONAL COMPONENT IN STATE REGULATIONS

DESIGNATOR	FREQUENCY*
"Foundations of education"	(10)
"Philosophy of education"	(9)
"History of education"	(7)
"Psychological foundations of education"	(5)
"Social foundations of education"	(4)
"Philosophical foundations of education"	(3)
"Comparative education"	(2)
"Historical foundations of education"	(2)
"Introduction to education"	(2)
"Principles of education"	(2)
"Cultural foundations of education"	(1)
"Current issues in education"	(1)
"Educational context or system"	(1)
"Human and intercultural relations"	(1)
"Methodological foundations of education"	(1)
"Multicultural education"	(1)
"Orientation in education"	(1)
"School as social institution"	(1)
"School in relation to society"	(1)
"Sociology of education"	(1)
"Study of the school"	(1)
("Non-foundational" areas included under a common "foundations" rubric include:)	
"Community sociology"	
"Community resources"	
"Social anthropology"	
"Finance"	
"Organization of the schools"	
"School organization (and management)"	
"Administration"	
"Curriculum"	
"Tests and measurements"	

*Some terms are employed more than once within a given state's regulations.

listed from which a student in an approved teacher preparatory program might select. Thus, in Oklahoma "social foundations of education" is only one of five or six possible alternatives within a twenty-one hour total; South Carolina lists "principles and philosophy of education" among six areas in a twelve hour total of professional education requirements; and in Arizona "psychological and philosophical foundations" appears as a required element among eight units or areas (including student teaching) within a 24-hour total of "professional preparation" courses. In New Jersey's rules, the fifteen-hour total of professional education is divided up among no less than eight areas, yielding an approximate average of 1.8 hours for each if coursework were actually distributed evenly among them.

Table 3 summarizes the data from the sixteen states that include foundations as an area among several in a total professional education sequence, but without mandating a specific course or a fixed number of credit hours.

At least three states appear to mandate a specific approach to teaching foundations courses or specify a desired outcome. Iowa's "human relations" guidelines urge coursework calculated to "develop sensitivity to and understanding of the values, beliefs, life styles, and attitudes of individuals and the diverse groups found in a pluralistic society." Kansas requires a coursework sequence devoted to "developing a professional attitude regarding the role of education in the 'American way of life.'" The same regulations call for instruction aimed at fostering "understanding of philosophies of education and their implications for . . . education."

Although no systematic comparisons were undertaken as a part of this study, it is instructive to note certain possible changes and shifts in emphasis within state regulations over the past decade or so. Several notable trends have developed. Required coursework in the teaching of reading has been expanded. As states continue to revise their certification requirements and teacher education program standards, there is growing emphasis upon psychology: learning theory; instructional assessment and evaluation; child development; counseling; and so forth. Courses in instructional media and materials have been added, sometimes as separate areas of endorsement or specialization for certified secondary school teachers. More states have moved to an "approved program" approach to initial certification. Regulations in some states have become more detailed and specific, but offer more flexibility and a greater number of alternatives. Fewer required courses in teaching methodology are identified by name or title. Most significantly, the general impression suggested is that relative to other component elements among the regulations, the place of coursework which is identifiably "foundational" in character has suffered erosion. With due allowance for exceptions, the overall trend points toward *decreasing* importance for foundations of education in certification requirements and as required elements within the total coursework pattern of state-approved teacher preparation programs.

Also noteworthy is the frequency (or lack thereof) with which state regulations require foundations courses in programs of continuing and in-service graduate education. A total of seventeen states' regulations make some reference to work in foundations. However, the requirement is not levied uniformly or for all types of special endorsements even within a given state. Frequently, the term appears simply as an elective possibility rather than as a requirement in a typical program. Table 4 supplies an abbreviated summary of such state requirements and guidelines.

CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

1. State regulations and guidelines concerning initial teacher certification and standards for state-approved teacher preparation programs differ greatly in terms of basic conception, format, organization, and degree of specificity. Many regulations appear to be poorly written or suffer from ambiguity and imprecision in usage of terms. Inter-state differences render comparisons extremely difficult, and in some cases impossible.
2. There may be extremely important academic and scholarly advantages in eschewing any single stipulative definition of "foundations of education." There are also several "political-tactical" and professional disadvantages involved. Not the least of these is the difficulty of demarcating clearly those substantive elements within a teacher education program which can be readily identified as "foundational" in both character and intent. Serious problems of definition are likely to attend any attempt to sort out the foundational elements in initial teacher certification requirements and state-mandated teacher education program guidelines or standards.
3. The lack of definitional consensus or shared outlook as to the content or "structure" of foundational studies among scholars is reflected—and magnified—by officialdom (state education bureaucracies in particular) and the general public at large. The frequent association of the term "foundations of education" with elements such as school management, administration, organization, and so forth may betray widespread confusion about—or indifference to—the logical boundaries (if any) of the term.
4. The typical conjunction of the modifier "psychological" with "foundations of education" tends to make it impossible to pick out "behavioral" from "humanistic" component elements when both are subsumed under a common rubric. Likewise, curriculum theory which is argueably "foundational" in character, as well as other types of

TABLE 3

THE FOUNDATIONS COMPONENT AS AN INDETERMINATE ELEMENT WITHIN A TOTAL PROFESSIONAL EDUCATION REQUIREMENT

STATE	CERTIFICATION LEVEL	TOTAL SEMESTER HOURS OF REQUIRED PROFESSIONAL EDUCATION COURSE WORK*	FOUNDATIONAL COMPONENT DESIGNATORS	TOTAL NUMBER OF AREAS WITHIN COURSE PATTERN**
Arizona	elem. sec.	24* 22*	psychological and philosophical foundations	8** 5**
Arkansas	elem. sec.	12 12	study of the school	4 3
Colorado	both	unspecified	foundations of education, including history, philosophy, financing, and organization of the public . . . schools; current issues in education	4
Connecticut	elem. sec.	30 18	foundations of education: history, principles, philosophy, comparative, community sociology, community resources, social anthropology	6 6
Georgia	both	20	foundations of education	3
Idaho	elem. sec.	18 14	philosophical, psychological, and methodological foundations of education	3 3
Maine	elem. sec.	24 12	the educational context or system	3 3
Massachusetts	elem. sec.	16 10	philosophy of education	4 4
Missouri	early childhood	10	foundations of education and school organization and management	7
	elem.	10	foundations of education	7
New Jersey	both	15	human and intercultural relations; foundations of education (history, philosophy, social foundations, comparative, sociology of education)	8
New Mexico	elem. sec.	18 12	orientation in education	5 5
Oklahoma	elem. sec.	15 15	social foundations/philosophical and historical foundations	6 6
Oregon	elem. (basic) sec.	24* 20*	social and cultural foundations social and cultural foundations, including . . . role of minority groups in . . . society	6** 6**
South Carolina	elem. sec.	15 12	principles and philosophy of education	6 4
Tennessee	both	20	historical, philosophical, and sociological foundations . . . with attention to the teacher's role in the school and community	
Wyoming	elem. sec.	23* 20*	foundations of education	5** 5**

*excludes student teaching hours unless otherwise indicated by an asterisk.

**excludes student teaching and/or field experiences as an area unless otherwise indicated by a double asterisk.

theoretical concerns and inquiry, may not be sufficiently well recognized as being generic to the category "foundations of education."

5. Where foundational coursework in education is conceptualized in terms of its association with particular cognate disciplines, the specialized fields of philosophy and history of education are most clearly established, as reflected by their relatively frequent appearance in official state documents. Comparative and/or international education is rarely mentioned. Nor are sociology of education, economics and education, political science and education, education and religion studies, educational anthropology and similar conjunctions. Terms such as "education(al) studies" or "education(al) policy studies" are not cited at all in the literature surveyed for this study.

6. The phrase "foundations of education," judging from the place accorded it in state regulations, is a misnomer, a term of courtesy or convenience only. Even on the most generous reading, foundational studies more often than not are relegated to a peripheral or ceremonial role; they are not in any meaningful sense positioned so that they are "foundational" to other elements in state-approved teacher preparatory programs.

7. Only a minority of states has regulations in compliance with Standard #1 of the American Educational Studies Association: "At least one-sixth of the professional preparation leading to initial teacher certification is to be devoted to humanistic and social foundational studies which promote the development of interpretive, normative, and critical perspectives on education." Nor are many states in compliance with the equivalent standard for continuing in-service and graduate-level professional studies in education.

8. Concerted pressure seems called for to insure a more adequate place for the foundational components in state-mandated teacher certification regulations and teacher education program guidelines or standards. As competition grows for shares within already-overcrowded teacher preparatory curricula, sharply-focused lobbying on behalf of foundational studies will become increasingly essential. Without strong professional support from state and national learned societies in foundations of education, such courses will likely continue to decline in importance within certification and program regulations.

9. The several learned societies and associations in foundations of education and education policy studies (AESA, PES, HES, CIES, etc.) share a vested interest in retaining foundational courses as required elements in state regulations concerning teacher education and certification. If their respective members do not recognize or widely acknowledge that vested interest, professional self-interest dictates that they ought to do so. Academic appointments in colleges and universities depend to a greater extent than may be commonly realized upon such requirements. Without mandated coursework, student enrollment in foundations classes could

TABLE 4

SUMMARY OF STATE REQUIREMENTS INVOLVING FOUNDATIONS OF EDUCATION FOR ADVANCED IN-SERVICE ENDORSEMENTS

STATE	POSITION OR ENDORSEMENT	COURSEWORK DESCRIPTION
Arizona	school psychologist	educational philosophy/ administration
Arkansas	guidance counselor	educational philosophy
Connecticut	superintendent	foundations of education (historical, philosophical, sociological, etc.)
Illinois	administration	basic foundations courses in education
Indiana	administration and supervision	philosophy of education
Kansas	district school administrator	sociological and philosophical foundations of education
Kentucky	special education; administration; media supervisor	foundations in education—sociological, psychological philosophical, historical
Massachusetts	school psychologist	educational foundations: school structure, administration, and philosophy
Nevada	school counselor	foundations of education, including multicultural education
New Hampshire	superintendent; assistant superintendent	(skills, competencies, and knowledge in) educational philosophy and program development
New Mexico	administration	foundations of education such as history, philosophy psychology and/or sociology

TABLE 4 (continued)

STATE	POSITION OR ENDORSEMENT	COURSEWORK DESCRIPTION
North Carolina	administrator	knowledge of current status of societal institutions in relation to the educational institution
	school counselor	(extended) understanding of basic educational philosophies and school curriculum patterns
Ohio	administration	social, philosophical or psychological foundations (of education)
South Carolina	guidance counselor	societal forces and cultural changes (in relation to education)
Tennessee	principal	philosophy and history of education, psychological and sociological foundations (of education)
	supervisor in instruction	goal determination . . . psychological and sociological foundations (of education)
West Virginia	principal; school superintendent	philosophy of education
Wisconsin	administration	problems, issues, and trends in education

decline. If the decline were of sufficient magnitude, many academic appointments would be terminated. To phrase it in the starkest terms possible, without required courses, there would be fewer opportunities for academic employment among foundational scholars. Lacking jobs, there will be lessened opportunities to sustain scholarly research and inquiry. The field or fields commonly subsumed under "foundations of education" will suffer a precipitate decline as a direct consequence. In sum, mandated coursework is a necessary (though of course not sufficient) condition for the general well-being of the field.

10. Considering the political realities involved and the number of competing pressure groups seeking to help shape state educational policy, it would seem counter-productive for each learned society to attempt to draw up its own standards and have them adopted within the several states' regulations. The result would probably be a kind of "internecine warfare" as rival groups compete to dominate a very small percentage of the total teacher education program. More useful, perhaps, would be a very brief definition and description of the foundational component which would be acceptable to all parties involved. In this respect at least, the several societies must work together or not at all.

NOTES

1. This judgment holds true despite the fact that most teacher training institutions attempt to offer programs whose requirements exceed state department of education standards. Joel Spring expresses the point more forthrightly than most. "Faculties of colleges of education," he observes, "are in a unique position vis-à-vis state educational policy. In the first place, their very jobs often depend on state certification requirements. If certain courses are required for teaching or public school administration, then the education faculties will be guaranteed that students must take their courses." Joel Spring, *American Education, An Introduction to Social and Political Aspects* (New York: Longman, 1978), p. 131.

2. National Council For Accreditation Of Teacher Education, *Standards for Accreditation of Teacher Education* (Washington: NCATE, 1977), pp. 5-6.

3. Cited in Elizabeth H. Woellner, *Requirements for Certification, Forty-third Edition 1978-79* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1978), p.2.

4. National Association of State Directors of Teacher Education and Certification, *Standards For State Approval Of Teacher Education* (Salt Lake City: NASDTEC, 1976), p. 17.

5. Summary descriptions of certification requirements are supplied in James Monroe Hughes and Frederick Marshall Schultz, *Education in America*, fourth edition (New York: Harper & Row, 1976), pp. 48ff.; and in Bruce R. Joyce and Greta G. Morine, *Creating The School. An Introduction to Education* (Boston: Educational Associates, 1976), pp. 52ff.

6. G.K. Hodenfield and T.M. Stinnett, *The Education of Teachers* (Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, 1961), pp. 101-103.

7. Cf. T.M. Stinnett, *Professional Problems of Teachers* (New York: Macmillan, 1968), pp. 421ff.; and J.H. Johansen et al., *American Education, The Task and the Teacher*, second edition (Dubuque, Iowa: W.C. Brown, 1975), p. 28.

8. For example, Georgia offers three different kinds of five-year certificates and two types of four-year certificates. California offers four levels of certification. Alabama's certificates are organized by classes: B, A, and AA. Nebraska distinguishes among "pre-standard," "standard," and "professional" licensure.

9. This essentially is the approach followed by Canadian provincial authorities as well.

10. Woellner, p. 2. The NEA publication is prepared by that organization's National Commission On Teacher Education and Professional Standards (TEPS).

11. "Standards For Academic And Professional Instruction In Foundations Of Education, Educational Studies And Educational Policy Studies," *Educational Studies* 8 (Winter 1977-78): 330.